DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 189 TM 007 380

AUTHOR Mojkowski, Charles
TITLE Evaluation of the ESEA Title IV Program in New Jersey for Fiscal Year 1977. A Report of the State Advisory Council.
INSTITUTION Educational Consulting Services, North Providence, R.I.
PUB DATE 30 Sep 77
NOTE 115p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Assessment; Educational Finance; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Innovation; Instructional Materials; Interviews; Private Schools; *Program Administration; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; School Libraries; School Visitation; State Departments of Education; *State Programs; *State Surveys; Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title IV B; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title IV C; New Jersey

ABSTRACT

The evaluation data for this report on the Elementary Secondary Education Act Title IV Programs in New Jersey include published material, "fugitive" documents from the files of New Jersey Department of Education staff, statistical information compiled especially for this study, numerous interviews with members of the Department and visits to 38 local districts. Title IV provides funds to purchase school library or other instructional resources; develop, field test, and disseminate innovative programs; and assist the state to identify and meet educational needs. Three basic questions were: (1) To what extent did the state adhere to the multiple elements of each program, as set forth in the 1976 Annual Program Plan?; (2) In what respects did the procedures used support or hinder efficiency in program administration and achievement of program objectives?; and (3) To what extent have program objectives for each part of Title IV actually been achieved? In nearly every instance, the administrative procedures and activities set forth in New Jersey's Annual Program Plan were carried out in an exemplary fashion, as they had been in the 1976 fiscal year program. (Author/CTM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles Majkowski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ED159189

ECS

EDUCATIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES

60 Gardner Avenue
North Providence, Rhode Island 02911

TM007 380

EVALUATION OF THE
ESEA TITLE IV PROGRAM IN NEW JERSEY
FOR FISCAL YEAR 1977

A REPORT OF THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL

EDUCATIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES

Charles Mojkowski, Ed.D.

September 30, 1977

EVALUATION OF THE

ESEA TITLE IV PROGRAM IN NEW JERSEY

FOR FISCAL YEAR 1977

A REPORT OF THE STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL

September 30, 1977

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The Title IV Program in New Jersey is comprised of three program elements. The programs provide funds to:

- Purchase school library or other instructional resources; for minor remodeling of publicly owned classroom space; or for programs of guidance, counseling and testing. During FY 1977, $4,589,353 was allocated to 570 local school districts in New Jersey. Seven hundred forty-two non-public schools also participated in the Program.

- Develop, field test, and disseminate innovative programs to meet documented educational needs as contrasted with services to specific student populations. During FY 1977, $2,273,058 was awarded to local school districts in New Jersey.

- Assist the State Education Agency in establishing and improving programs to identify and meet educational needs at the State and local levels. During FY 1977, $1,696,829 was spent on "strengthening SEA" activities in New Jersey.

During FY 1976, New Jersey administered the Title IV Program as well as the individual categorical programs it now replaces. During FY 1977,

through reorganization and consolidation, the Department has administered the Program through the Office of the Deputy Commissioner. Responsibilities for specific program activities are delegated to appropriate Department staff. A State Title IV Director administers the Annual Program Plan and coordinates all Title IV administrative activities.

The State Title IV Advisory Council is required to evaluate all programs and projects assisted under the Title. Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 134.16 states:

> The annual program plan shall provide for . . . an evaluation by the State Advisory Council at least annually, of the effectiveness of the programs and projects assisted under the annual program plan . . .

This regulation provides the authority for the present evaluation of the ESEA Title IV Program in New Jersey.

This evaluation builds on that conducted for the FY 1976 Program. The methodologies employed in that evaluation have been continued this year with some changes to improve data collection procedures.

The evaluation data for the report include published material and reports, "fugitive" documents from files of Department staff, statistical information compiled especially for this study, numerous interviews with members of the Department, and for Part IV-B, thirty-eight on-site local district evaluation visits.

The report of evaluation addressed three basic questions:

- To what extent did the state adhere to the multiple elements of each program, as set forth in the Annual Program Plan, submitted in 1976 to the U.S. Office of Education?
- In what respects did the procedures used support or hinder efficiency in program administration and achievement of program objectives?

- To what extent have program objectives for each part of Title IV actually been achieved?

EVALUATION FINDINGS

Adherence to the Plan

In nearly every instance, the administrative procedures and activities set forth in New Jersey's Annual Program Plan were carried out in an exemplary fashion. This performance continues that realized in the conduct of the FY 1976 Program.

With respect to Title IV-B, all process requirements were followed. These included using appropriate financial information and preparing formulas for the distribution of funds; preparing a single application; providing instructions, technical assistance, and in-service training; monitoring and evaluating; and assuring maintenance of effort and non-public school participation.

With one exception, the IV-C, Education Innovation Program fulfilled all of the above process requirements and also complied with those relating to evaluation, validation, and dissemination. The one exception to compliance with IV-C process requirements specified in the Annual Program Plan was with respect to non-public school participation. Nearly half of the IV-C proposals submitted failed to provide documentation of efforts to include non-public schools in the planning of the proposal. The State was in compliance with the Title IV legislation in that all funded projects documented appropriate non-public school involvement.

All of the objectives and activities projected in the Annual Program Plan for "Strengthening the SEA" were addressed by the Department during

FY 1977. In a few instances, activities were conducted which exceeded the minimum requirements of the Plan. Major activities undertaken were: 1) the implementation of the Operational Planning System; 2) the implementation of the intermediate unit structure; 3) dissemination of information on T&E through Interact, the Department newspaper; and, 4) an increased service capacity for supporting LEA T&E efforts.

Assessment of the Process

Beyond the fulfillment of the requirements of the Plan, several activities undertaken by the Department were found to be particularly effective. For IV-B, these are:

1) Part B Allocation Formulas. This complex set of formulas appears to respond to the letter and the spirit of the legislation. The formulas have been cited by the U.S. Office of Education and adopted or adapted by other states.

2) Efforts to Involve School Districts. The Department was able to provide funds to 570 school districts during FY 1977, an increase of thirty-five over FY 1976. A second application opportunity was extended to all districts which did not apply originally and seven districts were funded.

3) Non-Public School Involvement. Ninety-seven percent of all eligible districts participated in Title IV-B in FY 1977 and 94 percent of all non-public schools also participated. The Department took special steps to extend Title IV-B dollars to all eligible districts and schools.

4) Technical Assistance. Documentation and interviews indicated that the Department provided assistance to all local districts requesting help. The services of the Department were rated as excellent by the majority of local administrators.

Some Part C administrative procedures also were found to be of high quality. These are:

1) Reorganization of IV-C Program. The reorganization of the IV-C Program coordinated IV-C activities with those similar activities in the Department. The impact of IV-C will be enhanced and made more visible as a result of its integration

with T&E ("thorough and efficient"), the educational planning system mandated for all school districts in New Jersey.

2) Review of IV-C Proposals. While not required, the Department continued its practice of using outside readers for proposals in order to assure a high quality review. State Advisory Council members also took an active role in the review process.

3) Technical Assistance. Continuing a practice begun in FY 1977, the Title IV-C staff extended assistance to all districts in reviewing drafts of proposals prior to submission. It is likely that assistance from the staff was instrumental in increasing the number of applications by nearly 70 percent over FY 1976.

The activities and services developed and implemented in the conduct of the Strengthening SEAs Program were found to be of high quality. The development and implementation of a T&E educational system served as a reference point for all of the six objectives established in the Annual Program Plan.

Certain processes implemented in the conduct of the Program during FY 1977 could be strengthened in future years. Problems with respect to these processes are as follows:

1) There does not appear to be an adequate process for ensuring that each IV-C application contains the required documentation regarding efforts to involve non-public schools.

2) With respect to IV-C, data and data collection requirements have changed in some cases between FY 1976 and FY 1977, making it difficult to build a longitudinal data base for the Program.

Assessment of Outcomes and Impact

Outcomes and impact for the three component parts of Title IV must be judged at different levels. While it is possible to identify outcomes for each of the three components, it is much more difficult to assess the impact of the activities and services on student performance or other

individual or organizational changes, particularly with respect to Part B and Strengthening SEA. For example, it is possible to identify the outcomes of IV-B expenditures in terms of library materials and equipment purchased. It is much more difficult to assess the impact of the materials and equipment on student learning. This latter form of assessment has yet to be addressed, in part because local school districts are not required to evaluate their IV-B projects.

In terms of Title IV-B outcomes, the on-site evaluation studies indicate that the funds are spent to purchase needed materials in support of an on-going or new project or program. Districts infrequently use the funds for testing, counseling, and guidance programs. The expenditures by category for non-public schools nearly parallel those of the public schools.

As evidenced by the on-site evaluation studies, local discretion has not resulted in frivolous allocation of funds, although it appears to be the case that the targeting of the limited funds to a particular school or program demonstrates more measurable impact. Meaningful integration with the local T&E process also appears to enhance impact. Finally, maintenance of effort for state and local districts does not appear to be impeded. During FY 1976 and 1977, New Jersey has been able to exceed maintenance of effort requirements.

With respect to Title IV-C, both outcome and impact assessment are built-in requirements of each project, thus facilitating a determination of total Program impact. Objectives for each project are written in terms of specific improvements in student learning or teacher behavior. The large number of projects validated nationally or within New Jersey attest to the impact of the projects.

Of nineteen projects disseminated by the State in FY 1977, eighty-eight New Jersey districts and 129 out-of-state districts adopted them. Nearly complete information shows that approximately 252,344 New Jersey students and 6,939 teachers in New Jersey (duplicated counts) were affected by them. Counting previous years, a total of 483 adoptions had taken place in New Jersey. Also, over the five years (1972-76) for which data were available, eighty-two projects completed development and seventy-nine continued with local funding.

For the Strengthening the SEA Program, while outcome indicators are in more plentiful supply than in FY 1976, impact data still are difficult to obtain. Both activities and the products of this Program are of good quality and reflect the best of theory and practice out it is difficult to judge impact.

The intermediate unit structure which was implemented fully in FY 1977 is providing an extensive amount of quality services to local school districts and feedback from LEA personnel is positive. The implementation of a formal evaluation of EIC services in FY 1978 will provide more reliable and valid impact data.

Considerable progress was made in the design and implementation of the Operational Planning System during FY 1976. The inclusion of the County Offices and the EICs in the process will make it possible to tie the Department and the intermediate units together more closely in terms of T&E related objectives and the delivery of appropriate services.

Interact continues to disseminate timely and high-quality articles on T&E activities. During FY 1977, every issue contained at least one

article addressed to T&E and one entire issue was devoted to the process. Limited use of other channels of communication regarding T&E were also used.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The overall conduct of the Title IV Program in New Jersey is characterized by high quality activities and outcomes. Where impact data are available, they indicate that such activities are having a positive influence on student learning and on the overall educational program in local school districts.

The following recommendations are based on an intensive review of the Title IV process as it is carried out in New Jersey and of its outcomes. The recommendations are offered in the spirit of strengthening New Jersey's already highly productive Title IV Program.

Management

1) Consider the development of a formal assessment of the management of Title IV. Such an evaluation should address at a minimum the following elements: planning, quality control procedures, communication, personnel management, State Advisory Council involvement, monitoring and evaluation procedures, and dissemination. Such an assessment might emphasize a particular management process from year to year, depending on available resources. If such is the case, it is suggested that the dissemination function in the Title IV Program be given consideration for early review since it appears to be a critical element in all three program areas.

Part B

2) Formalize the selection of Title IV-B exemplary projects using the entire population of projects from which the selection is made. Self-nomination may be an appropriate way to narrow the field. Adapting some of the procedures used for reviewing Title IV-C projects may be a means of transferring some of the clarity and accountability of the Title IV-C process to the best IV-B projects.

3) Broaden the dissemination effort for Part B exemplary projects. Consider using publications and presentations at orientation sessions and workshops in addition to the awards presentation at the Educational Development Conference. Disseminate information about projects that focus IV-B monies on special projects or target populations or which are integrated with the LEA T&E process.

4) Provide LEAs with a wide range of sample objectives which are meaningful and useful. Suggest ways in which simple assessment techniques can be used to ascertain whether the money is being well spent. It is possible that appropriate evaluation procedures might be developed during FY 1978 and used by those districts wishing to be considered as exemplary. At the State level, consider the use of a select number of carefully developed case studies to illustrate the variety of exemplary uses to which IV-B funds can be directed.

Part C

5) Improve and standardize where possible the data requirements and the data collection formats developed during FY 1976 and 1977. Changes should be made only where benefits in information utility will be increased substantially. Additional data requirements and formats should be added to the basic design as new information needs are identified.

6) Establish a review procedure which checks all submitted applications for compliance with requirements regarding non-public school participation in planning and implementation of IV-C projects. An inexpensive clerical review process would provide sufficient review.

7) Continue to track progress of consumer districts in achieving statistically significant gains for IV-C projects to match those of producer districts in adopting the new program in the new setting. Studies of the change process indicate that the process of implementation of an innovation involves a complex set of changes over a long period of time. The lack of extensive study in this area could provide an opportunity for the New Jersey Department of Education to extend its leadership in the area of innovation.

8) This same area of change (implementation) could also be addressed through continued pursuit of a joint development process among several districts. The "lighthouse" concept of innovation is only one alternative for facilitating improvement in educational programs and practices. This area, also, is one in which the experience of Department staff might be put to use in designing new directions in development.

Strengthening the SEA

9) Measuring the outcomes and impact of Strengthening SEA activities is impeded by the lack of measurable and proximate indicators of achievement. Many of the activities in the Annual Program Plan are stated in global and vague language. Specifications in operational terms are seldom available. Such specifications would facilitate the development of formative and summative evaluation designs which, when implemented, could become part of the on-going administration of the activity.

10) As in FY 1976, the Department relied heavily on Interact for its communications regarding T&E. While Interact is a high quality, one-way communications mechanism, formal feedback mechanisms should be employed. The Department should consider the use of multiple methods for ascertaining reader response to the paper, particularly to those articles dealing with T&E. "Town Meeting II" represents an excellent model for moving in that direction.

11) An effort should be made to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the EICs vis-a-vis the County Offices. Available descriptive material does not accomplish this. Also, some attention should be given to helping the EICs establish a clear mission statement which addresses such issues as their relationships with the Department and with the LEAs and the degree to which they are to offer similar services as opposed to "unique" services addressed to regional needs. The EICs represent a major organizational innovation, thus requiring clarity of purpose and role for effective implementation.

12) Because T&E is a major innovation which is receiving much national attention and because Title IV, particularly the Strengthening SEAs Program, is so integrated with it, the Department should consider the development of a broad case study of the design and implementation process. This information would be most useful as a summary of the specific information being collected in the State and would provide a valuable service to other SEAs engaged in similar activities. The T&E effort in New Jersey has several features which are exemplary and worthy of dissemination nationally.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Title IV in New Jersey is a major program involving a substantial proportion of Department staff and a large amount of money. To document and evaluate such a program requires the cooperation and collaboration of a large number of persons.

Special thanks are extended to Mr. Joseph Fittipaldi, Chairman of New Jersey's Title IV State Advisory Council and to Mr. Joseph Dimino, Chairman of the Council's Evaluation Subcommittee for their assistance in focusing the evaluation on important information needs and for reviewing progress along the way.

Within the Department, Dr. Ralph Lataille, Deputy Commissioner, and Dr. Joseph Picogna, State Title IV Director, provided guidance and direction as well as assistance in procuring documentation.

Others in the Department assisted in preparing documentation for the evaluation. Their names are provided at the end of this Report.

My goal was to produce useful information for the State Advisory Council and the Title IV staff. If I succeeded in doing so, it is in part because of the work of these individuals. If I have failed, it is despite their efforts.

Charles Mojkowski, Ed.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Title	Page
I.	Introduction	I-1
II.	Title IV Management	
	A. Introduction	II-1
	B. Process Assessment	II-2
	C. Discussion	II-5
	D. Implications for Future Planning	II-6
III.	Title IV-B, Libraries and Learning Resources	
	A. Introduction	III-1
	B. Adherence to the Plan	III-3
	C. Assessment of the Process	III-11
	D. Assessment of Outcomes and Impact	III-14
	E. Implications for Future Planning	III-17
IV.	Title IV-C, Educational Innovation	
	A. Introduction	IV-1
	B. Adherence to the Plan	IV-3
	C. Assessment of the Process	IV-22
	D. Assessment of Outcomes and Impact	IV-25
	E. Implications for Future Planning	IV-28
V.	Title IV-C, Program for Strengthening Leadership Resources of State Education Agencies	
	A. Introduction	V-1
	B. Adherence to the Plan	V-3
	C. Assessment of the Process	V-13
	D. Assessment of Outcomes and Impact	V-14
	E. Implications for Future Planning	V-18
VI.	Annotated Listing of Appendices	
	Management	VI-1
	Title IV-B	VI-2
	Title IV-C, Educational Innovation	VI-5
	Title IV-C, Strengthening SEA	VI-10
VII.	Persons Interviewed	VII-1

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND OF TITLE IV

With few exceptions, categorical programs have been lauded by Congress and berated by the state and local governments that serve as administrative agents for them. The appeal of such programs to Congress is that they make it possible to target monies to specific needs or populations. The bane of such programs to state and local governments is that they reduce opportunities for adjusting to local needs and create inefficiency and waste in their administration.

ESEA, Title IV, the first major consolidation of federal education funds, was viewed by members of Congress as a compromise, simplifying program administration for both state and local governments while retaining some of the categorical character of the previous programs. FY 1976 was considered a "phase-in" year, with 50 percent funding of Title IV and 50 percent funding of the old categorical programs.

Although Title IV is funded as two block grants, Parts B and C, the Program has three major, somewhat disparate components. There is little that binds the three component programs together beyond the title, and State Education Agencies (SEAs) and local education agencies (LEAs) are hard-pressed to put any two of them together for a coherent fit.

There are some elements of the Program that enhance its utility to SEAs and LEAs (although sometimes not to both parties, depending on the

element). Priorities for funding are left to state and local judgment. Only a single application from an LEA is allowed - the paperwork burden on LEAs is thus reduced.

Use of Part B funds within authorized purposes is determined exclusively at the local level, and priorities for Part C discretionary funds are set by the states. There are ceilings on funds for state program administration in both Parts B and C, and on use of funds for ESEA Title V type activities (strengthening state and local education agencies) in Part C. There is also a set-aside to support programs for the handicapped in Part C. Equitable participation of children in private, non-profit schools must be provided in all local programs and projects. The law also provides guidelines on distribution of funds by the states to the local education agencies:

> Part B -- A maximum of 5 percent (or $225,000, whichever is greater) of the funds may be used for state administration, and the remaining 95 percent of the funds must be distributed to LEAs according to enrollment (public and private, non-profit), special fiscal effort, and numbers of high-cost children.
>
> Part C -- After the maximum set-aside for strengthening state and local education agencies (15 percent or the amount received in FY 1973, whichever is greater) and for state administration (5 percent of the remainder, or $225,000, whichever is greater) project grants are made for local projects on the basis of state-determined priorities on an "equitable basis" recognizing the competitive nature of the grantmaking. States are, however, required to provide assistance in formulating proposals and in operating programs to LEAs which are less able to compete due to small size or lack of local financial resources. Fifteen percent of the funds (after the set-aside for strengthening state and local education agencies) must be used for programs and projects for the education of children with specific learning disabilities and handicapped children.

Since the initiation of the programs included in the Title IV consolidation, some of which became active in 1959, several billions of dollars have been provided by federal appropriations for the affected programs. Current

appropriations (FY 1977) are $348 million (Part B $154 million, Part C $194 million).

Features of the Title IV consolidation of particular interest include:

1. The first year of implementation (FY 1976) was on the basis of a 50-50 split between categorical and consolidated administration. Rules, regulations, and requirements for the separate categorical programs were in effect for half the funds.

2. States determine the priorities for use of Part C funds, but are limited by requirements or limitations on uses of funds for state administration, provision of services for the handicapped, and activities for strengthening state and local education agencies.

3. Requirements for participation of private non-profit schools are most stringent than previously. Local education agencies are charged with use of funds for the benefit of private non-profit school children in proportion to the percentage of public school children receiving benefits and in consideration of their special needs.

4. Local education agencies have complete discretion within allowable categories in determining priorities for use of Part B funds.

5. States are to provide special assistance in formulating proposals and operating programs to small or poor school districts less able to compete in the Part C program.

6. Part B funds are to be distributed by the states to LEAs on the basis of school enrollment (public and private), except "substantial funds" are to go to districts with high tax effort but lower than average per pupil expenditure and those with the greatest numbers or percentage of high-cost pupils, such as children from low-income families, children living in sparsely populated areas, and children from families in which English is not the dominant language.

7. A State Advisory Council is required in each state to advise on administration of the program, evaluate programs and projects, and prepare an annual report. SEAs are to provide necessary funds and resources.

8. A single application is required from local education agencies applying for funds under any program under Title IV.

9. A maintenance of effort requirement, applicable to both public and private school expenditures.

B. TITLE IV IN NEW JERSEY

During FY 1976, New Jersey administered the Title IV Program as well as the individual categorical programs it now replaces. During FY 1977, through reorganization and consolidation, the Department has administered the Program through the Office of the Deputy Commissioner. Responsibilities for specific program activities are delegated to appropriate Department staff. A State Title IV Director administers the Annual Program Plan and coordinates all Title IV administrative activities.

The Title IV Program in New Jersey is comprised of three program elements. The programs provide funds to:

- Purchase school library or other instructional resources; for minor remodeling of publicly owned classroom space; or for programs of guidance, counseling and testing. During FY 1977, $4,589,353 was allocated to 570 local school districts in New Jersey. Seven hundred forty-two non-public schools also participated in the Program.

- Develop, field test, and disseminate innovative programs to meet documented educational needs as contrasted with services to specific student populations. During FY 1977, $2,273,058 was awarded to local school districts in New Jersey.

- Assist the State Education Agency in establishing and improving programs to identify and meet educational needs at the State and local levels. During FY 1977, $1,696,829 was spent on "strengthening SEA" activities in New Jersey.

A State Advisory Council advises the Commissioner and his staff on program policy and administration and prepares an annual evaluation of the State Program. This Report is the product of that latter responsibility.

The major coordinating mechanism for Title IV in New Jersey was the integrated educational planning process established for education in the State. This process, T&E ("thorough and efficient"), serves as a major organizer for the disparate elements of the Title IV Program. Using the T&E process, the State, the intermediate units, and the LEAs are able to focus their improvement efforts and use available resources in a more coherent and meaningful way.

C. EVALUATION OF TITLE IV

The State Title IV Advisory Council is required to evaluate all programs and projects assisted under the Title. Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 134.16 states:

> The annual program plan shall provide for . . . an evaluation by the State Advisory Council at least annually, of the effectiveness of the programs and projects assisted under the annual program plan . . .

This regulation provides the authority for the present evaluation of the ESEA Title IV Program in New Jersey.

This evaluation builds on that conducted for the FY 1976 Program. The methodologies employed in that evaluation have been continued this year with some changes. Three basic data collection processes were used in the FY 1976 evaluation:

1) Documentation Review. Published reports, correspondence, and other documents were reviewed and analyzed.

2) Interviews with SEA staff. The evaluators interviewed several SEA staff members to obtain documentation and to obtain other information.

3) On-Site Evaluation. For Part B, on-site interviews were conducted with local project administrators in a sample of districts.

In this year's evaluation, the following modifications and additions have been made to the FY 1976 process:

1) An interview schedule was prepared to standardize data collection during the Part B on-site evaluations. In addition to collecting more uniform information, the question areas were expanded for such topics as the project planning process and integration with the T&E process.

2) A self-assessment instrument was prepared for use with all professional staff engaged in strengthening SEA activities. This instrument assisted in more uniform data collection and focused attention on outcome and impact questions.

3) A review of Title IV management activities was initiated on a small scale. This area is viewed as a critical factor in the overall development of the Title IV Program in New Jersey.

Despite these improvements, there are still some conceptual and methodological improvements which can be made in the evaluation design and implementation. These will be addressed in the individual sections and in the overall recommendations regarding the Program.

It should be emphasized that the nature of some parts of the Program makes it difficult to quantify valid and reliable measures of impact. Relating expenditures for library books to student performance, for example, is likely to be an insurmountable methodological problem for some time to come. Our real intent is to produce useful information in response to important information needs and to make qualitative judgments about the effectiveness of policies and actions. Where quantitative measures of impact are unavailable, we should not be prevented from making fair and sound judgments of effectiveness.

D. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

Each of the four major areas are treated individually in Sections II, III, IV, and V of this Report. For Sections III, IV and V, a common presentation format is used. Following an introduction, the Department's compliance with process requirements in the Annual Program Plan is reviewed. A separate section deals with an assessment of outcomes and impact of the Program. Finally, implications for future planning are offered. Section V, which reviews the Strengthening SEAs Program, uses this same format with each of the five major areas described in the Annual Program Plan.

Because the documentation supporting this Report is extensive, all appendix materials have been annotated and organized in four sections corresponding to the four major evaluation sections of this Report. These appendix listings are collected in Section VI, Annotated Listing of Appendices. Finally, Section VII contains a listing of "Persons Interviewed."

SECTION II

TITLE IV MANAGEMENT

A. INTRODUCTION

Despite the fact that ESEA, Title IV is regarded as a single Program, much attention is given to the three individual programs of which it is comprised. Given that the three components are relatively diverse and unique and thus require individual assessments, it nevertheless is important to understand the administrative process for the total Program and to assess the quality of the overall management of the Program.

The Annual Program Plan (pp. 7-9) provides a description of the staffing pattern for the administration of Title IV. While the Commissioner of Education has overall responsibility for the administration of the State Plan, the Deputy Commissioner is delegated the responsibility for insuring that overall management, accounting, and interdepartmental coordinating functions are carried out. State Plan activities are monitored by the State Title IV Director, who reports directly to the Deputy Commissioner.

No formal evaluation questions were established for assessing the management of the Title IV Program, nor did the original scope of the evaluation address this area. During the process of data collection for the evaluation of the three component programs, it became apparent that an important facet of the Program was the day-to-day management provided by the Office of the State Title IV Coordinator. Rather than postpone an

assessment of this area until FY 1978, the evaluator collected some documentation and made some observations which may provide useful information for the present evaluation. Should this area be included in the scope of the FY 1978 evaluation, a more sophisticated data collection and evaluation process will need to be initiated.

Compliance with individual program requirements is assessed in Sections III, IV, and V of this Report. Two general areas of program administration are addressed in this Section: 1) management procedures, and 2) State Title IV Advisory Council involvement.

B. PROCESS ASSESSMENT

Management Procedures

Because of the large number of persons involved in the New Jersey Title IV-B Program, clear delineation of responsibilities is required. Such delineation is accomplished through the development of an overall PERT chart for the Program (II-1).* The PERT provides a detailed time line for the completion of each process requirement, together with a specification of persons responsible for the conduct of each activity. The State Title IV Coordinator used the PERT as a monitoring system and to signal the need for communications to appropriate Department staff members regarding required activities.

Since a major purpose of Title IV is the granting of funds to local school districts under Parts B and C, the communication process for passing judgment on individual grant awards is a major activity which must be managed carefully. Because several signatures were required in order to

*See Section VI, Annotated Listing of Appendices, for all references.

process a grant award, a routing slip and process were established to insure sound fiscal management and to introduce appropriate checks and balances into the grant award process. (II-2).

Communication is a major on-going activity of the Office of the State Title IV Coordinator. For this reason, the Coordinator and his staff maintain both formal and informal communications with the many individuals responsible for the conduct of specific activities. Appendix II-3 contains a sample of the communications sent out by the Coordinator. These communications cover such activities as: 1) alerting appropriate staff to time lines and process requirements; 2) assuring that Title IV is publicized adequately in Interact, the Department newspaper; and, 3) communicating with officials outside New Jersey at federal and state levels.

Title IV-C provides a major source of funds for program development and dissemination in New Jersey. For this reason the Title IV-C Program was reorganized during FY 1977 to strengthen the Department of Education's efforts to implement T&E. The reorganization resulted in a greater integration of IV-C operations with other development and dissemination efforts in the Department. Program visibility was maintained in the Department and in local school districts.

The reorganization plan assigned responsibility for major Title IV processes (e.g., determining priorities, fiscal management, and technical assistance) to specific Department units. A chart described the processes and responsibilities of each unit (II-4).

State Title IV Advisory Council Involvement

The State Title IV Advisory Council (SAC) plays a central role in the Title IV Program. Its functions are to:

1) advise the State educational agency on the preparation of, and policy matters arising in the administration of, the annual program plan, including the development of criteria for the distribution of funds and the approval of applications for assistance under Title IV of the Act.

2) evaluate all programs and projects assisted under Title IV of the Act at least annually.

3) prepare at least annually and submit through the State educational agency a report of its activities, recommendations, and evaluations, together with such additional comments as the State educational agency deems appropriate, to the Commissioner. (Annual Program Plan, p. 17)

While it is not within the scope of this Report to assess State Advisory Council activities, it is important to document that the SAC has been involved in an appropriate advisory capacity to the Commissioner of Education and to his staff. It is the role of Title IV management to insure that the SAC is informed and provides advice concerning major program activities.

The SAC meets both as a total group and in three subcommittees: 1) Title IV, Part B; 2) Title IV, Part C; and, 3) Evaluation and State Plan. SAC meeting agendas and minutes provide documentation of the nature of the involvement of the SAC (both total group and subcommittees) in the Title IV Program (II-5).

A review of the agendas and minutes indicates that the SAC was involved in the following major Program decisions:

1) Review of FY 1977 Annual Program Plan

2) Review of Title IV-B Program activities

3) Review of Title IV-C proposals

4) On-site evaluation of Title IV-C projects

5) Oversight of the evaluation of the Title IV Program

C. DISCUSSION

As was pointed out previously, a formal evaluation of the management of Title IV was not contemplated within the scope of work. The importance of this component is such that future evaluations should address it more thoroughly. The comments made below are offered in light of the obvious limitations of the assessment process used for this year.

In general, the management component of the Title IV Program appears to be functioning in an exemplary fashion. Overall management processes appear sound and the Title IV management staff appear to work as a team despite the fact that they are dispersed throughout the Agency. Management systems and communications are the major tools for maintaining program activities on schedule and in compliance with the Annual Program Plan. Program staff appeared well informed of the ever-changing federal regulations and requirements affecting the Program.

That the New Jersey Title IV Program is administered in an exemplary fashion is attested to by the U.S. Office of Education's invitation to the State Title IV Coordinator to make presentations on various aspects of the New Jersey Title IV Program at national conferences (II-6). Other states have sought information and advice from the New Jersey Title IV Program staff in addressing problems and issues related to Program management.

The SAC appears to be adequately involved in all appropriate Title IV activities. The evaluator has attended SAC meetings and has found the

members to be enthusiastic and energetic in the conduct of their responsibilities. The State Title IV Coordinator communicates frequently with the SAC Chairperson.

D. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE PLANNING

Because no formal assessment of the management of the Title IV Program was undertaken during FY 1977, it would be inappropriate to suggest improvements for consideration by the Title IV staff. Because of its importance, however, the SAC should consider whether such an assessment be made a formal part of the FY 1978 Title IV Evaluation.

An evaluation of the management of Title IV should address, at a minimum, the following elements:

1) planning
2) quality control procedures
3) communication
4) personnel management
5) State Advisory Council involvement
6) monitoring and evaluation procedures
7) dissemination

SECTION III

TITLE IV- B

LIBRARIES AND LEARNING RESOURCES

A. INTRODUCTION

Under Title IV, Part B, grants to the states are authorized for the following purposes:

1. for the acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, and other materials printed and published; materials for use by children and teachers in public and private schools

2. for the acquisition of instructional equipment (including laboratory and other special equipment, including audio-visual materials and equipment suitable for use in providing education in academic subjects) for use by children in elementary and secondary schools, and for minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used by such schools for such equipment

3. for a program of testing students in the elementary and secondary schools; programs of counseling and guidance services for students at the appropriate levels in elementary and secondary schools; and programs, projects and leadership activities designed to expand and strengthen counseling and guidance services in elementary and secondary schools.

The Act contains requirements providing for the equitable participation of children in private, non-profit schools. It further provides for the distribution of funds according to enrollment, except that LEAs with a greater tax burden or a higher percentage of children from low-income families would receive "substantial funds."

Beyond these limits, Part B is a highly flexible program, since the Act specifies that each local agency be given complete discretion to

spend funds within the three categories listed above. Local districts also have autonomy in identifying priorities and in evaluating their projects.

In New Jersey in FY 1977, 570 out of a total of 589 operating districts applied for and received funds. Thirteen non-operating districts and nineteen operating districts did not apply for funds. The net allotment for the funded districts was $4,589,353 (see Appendix IV-B-1).* This compares favorably with FY 1976 when 535 districts applied for and received $2,023,672. In that year, fifty-five operating districts did not apply for funds.

Evaluation Questions

Evaluation of Title IV-B is directed at acquiring evidence to answer three basic questions:

- To what degree has the process for conducting and managing Title IV-B as projected in the Annual Plan actually been carried out during the year?
- To what extent is the process itself likely to enhance or retard accomplishment of desired Title IV-B outcomes?
- To what extent have outcome objectives for Title IV-B actually been achieved?

Evaluation Methodology

The Annual Program Plan for Title IV-B for FY 1977 was reviewed and compared with that for FY 1976 in order to identify new objectives or activities for the Program. All process requirements described in the FY 1977 Plan were identified. For each process requirement, documentation and other evidence was sought to establish that the process requirements had been addressed. Finally a judgment of quality was made regarding the manner and form in which the requirements were met.

*See Section VI, Annotated Listing of Appendices, for all references.

Also, since this was the second year in which an evaluation of the IV-B Program was conducted, recommendations from that evaluation were reviewed and evidence was sought as to what had been done in response to the recommendations.

To provide more detailed information regarding the use of IV-B funds at the local level, the Department of Education conducted on-site interviews in a representative sample (N=38) of districts. An interview schedule was prepared covering such areas as the proposal development process, integration with T&E, and assessment of the Department of Education's assistance in IV-B project development. The completed interview forms were supplied to Educational Consulting Services for analysis. A report on the results of the on-site interviews is contained in Appendix IV-B-2 and is discussed below.

The text of this Section is organized to follow the FY 1977 Annual Program Plan. Page references to the Plan are provided.

B. ADHERENCE TO THE PLAN

1. Financial Data Submission (Annual Program Plan, p. 32)

The Program Plan stated that

> Application forms will require districts to submit data indicating financial support at the local district level and showing maintenance of effort in the three categories of Title IV, Part B. The LEA will be required to show maintenance of effort. Private schools are not required to demonstrate maintenance of effort.

Documentation

The New Jersey Department of Education's "Project Application, ESEA, Title IV-B" (Section D, p. 5 - IV-B-3) required only public schools to show actual local and state expenditures for 1975-76. The applications

from LEAs provided this information for the three categories of Title IV, Part B.

During FY 1977, the maintenance of effort requirements were extended to apply to both public and non-public schools. This requirement was made in April, 1977, making it impossible for the Department to implement it for projects already funded. This requirement, however, is reflected in the FY 1978 Annual Program Plan. Regulations for this legislative change have not been established as of the writing of this Report (IV-B-14).

2. Criteria for Distribution of Funds (Annual Program Plan, pp. 32-39).

Section 403(a) of the Act requires State Plans to provide assurance that

> funds such agency receives from appropriations made under Section 401(a) will be distributed among local educational agencies according to the enrollments in public and non-public schools within the school districts of such agencies, except that substantial funds will be provided to (i) local educational agencies whose tax effort for education is substantially greater than the state average tax effort for education, but whose per pupil expenditure (excluding payments made under Title I of this Act) is no greater than the average per pupil expenditure in the State, and (ii) local educational agencies which have the greatest number or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child, such as children from low income families, children living in sparsely populated areas, and children from families in which English is not the dominant language.

States were required to develop criteria for the distribution of Title IV, Part B funds which would meet these conditions for distribution.

Documentation

The 1976-77 Annual Program Plan, Section II.4.2, described the criteria for distribution of funds based on three formulas designed to satisfy the requirements of the law (IV-B-4). That distribution of funds was made through these formulas is demonstrated in the case of districts in Essex County as an example of the allocation process (IV-B-5).

3. Notification of Per Pupil Allotment (Annual Program Plan, p. 32)

The Program Plan states that

> Each local educational agency, upon the completion of the computation of its district's allotment according to the formula, will be notified of their per pupil funding, as well as the basis of the computation of their total district's allotment. The notification will also include the listing by school of the number of students and the extent of suggested participation of each non-public school within the geographic boundaries of the LEA.

Documentation

The notification of the LEA of its per pupil funding by school (including public and non-public) is illustrated by Appendix IV-B-6, a sample computer print-out notification for the Newark Board of Education. A letter of notification is shown in Appendix IV-B-7.

4. Report on Enrollment (Annual Program Plan, p. 32)

As required by P.L. 93-380, Section 403(a)(7), the Program Plan states that on application,

> LEAs will report the enrollment of children in the public and private schools. The LEA in consultation with administrators of private schools will include the enrollment of private schools who will identify students required by the formula for allocation.

Documentation

Basic data on enrollment in both public and non-public schools are to be reported in the LEA Project Application Form: public school enrollment data in Section A and non-public school enrollment data in Section F (IV-B-3).

5. Single Application (Annual Program Plan, p. 32)

The Program Plan states that

> A single application will be sent to the LEAs.

This requirement reflects the desire of Congress that

> local educational agencies applying for funds under any program under this title shall be required to submit only one application for such funds for any one fiscal year (P.L. 93-380, Section 403(a)(7).).

Documentation

The Program Announcement accompanying the Guidelines (IV-B-8) stated that

> The single application package replaces separate LEA applications for Title II, III, and V previously authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and Title III of the National Defense Education Act.

A single application package for Title IV was sent to all districts on September 9, 1976 (IV-B-7).

In reviewing IV-C proposals, the State Advisory Council determined that there was not a sufficient number of fundable proposals submitted. Since unexpended dollars were available, the Council requested a reopening of the application period and this reopening was extended to those districts which did not already receive Part B funds (IV-B-7). This second request for applications was authorized by a memorandum issued by the U.S. Office of Education (IV-B-9). Through this second effort, the Department of Education was able to award IV-B funds to an additional seven districts.

6. Instructions to Accompany Application Forms (Annual Program Plan, p. 32)

The Program Plan specifies that

> The application forms, which will be sent to the Superintendent or Administrative Head of each operating LEA, will be accompanied by instructions for any section that is not clearly self-explanatory. The instructions will include the operative deadline dates for the submission of the application, as well as the claim form.

Documentation

Guidelines for completion of ESEA, Title IV-B were disseminated with the application forms. The Guidelines provide for each of the three components of Part B, explanatory information, examples of eligible use and ineligible use of funds, standards and basic limitations, and other instructions for completing the application form (IV-B-8).

The Program Announcement accompanying the Guidelines gave the date for the receipt of IV-B applications as "January 7, 1977 postmarked, or January 10, 1977 hand delivered." The closing date for applications for the second announcement was set for May 2, 1977.

7. Technical Assistance (Annual Program Plan, p. 33)

The Program Plan states that

> Technical assistance will be provided to local educational agencies in project development:
>
> (1) identification of needs, short range and long range planning
>
> (2) establishment of priorities, immediate and long range
>
> (3) development of program objectives
>
> (4) monitoring
>
> (5) evaluation
>
> (6) dissemination

Documentation

Orientation sessions on the purposes, regulations, and method of application for Title IV-B funds were held during the year at each of the Educational Improvement Centers (EIC). The information conferences varied in length up to three hours. Almost all districts were represented at

one of the sessions. A schedule of the orientation sessions, held during the year is attached as Appendix IV-B-10.

In addition, numerous telephone inquiries and letters seeking clarification or answers to questions were responded to by State Department staff. Findings of the on-site evaluation teams indicate that districts were generally well satisfied with assistance provided by the Department of Education.

8. Inservice Education (Annual Program Plan, p. 34)

The Program Plan states

> Workshops will be conducted for Department, County and Educational Improvement Center Staff concerning procedures and requirements of Part B Title IV. County offices and/or Educational Improvement Centers will conduct orientation sessions for LEA and non-public school staff.

Documentation

Information conferences were conducted for Department, County, and EIC staff concerning procedures and requirements of Title IV-B (IV-B-10).

9. Evaluation and Reporting Procedures (Annual Program Plan, p. 34)

The Program Plan specifies that districts must report expenditures to demonstrate that federal funds are not supplanting local funds. The Program Plan states that Part B Programs will be monitored on a sampling basis, and that evaluation will be carried out using a self-evaluation questionnaire.

Documentation

Although the use of a self-assessment questionnaire was proposed for all recipient districts in FY 1977 (as it was in FY 1976), the Advisory

Council again amended this requirement and substituted the use of an on-site interview process. This amendment was in consonance with the Department's policy aimed at reducing the paperwork burdens of local school districts. The Report of Findings of On-Site Evaluations of a Sample of Title IV-B Projects is contained in Appendix IV-B-2 and discussed below.

10. Local Discretion on Use of Funds (Annual Program Plan, p. 35)

The Program Plan states that each local educational agency will be given complete discretion, subject to Title IV, P.L. 93-380, in determining how funds it receives will be divided among the various categories of expenditures and the various school buildings.

Documentation

The categories of expenditures planned by public and non-public schools is shown in Table 1 on page III-10. The most frequently chosen category for both public and non-public schools was library resources; the second most frequent choice was a combination of library resources and instructional equipment. Nevertheless, New Jersey schools in the aggregate made use of all the provisions of Title IV-B, and of combinations of them.

Data from the on-site interviews indicate that a significant proportion of non-public schools selected expenditure categories which were different from those selected by public schools in the same district. Within districts, expenditure patterns varied, with few schools using funds for equipment. The predominant fund allocation procedure within districts is in relation to pupil enrollment.

TABLE 1

Categories of Planned Expenditures of Title IV-B Funds

by Public and Non-Public Schools

FY 1977

Expenditure Category*	Districts			
	Public		Non-Public [1]	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A	219	38.4	106	36.6
B	53	9.3	26	8.9
C	14	2.5	4	1.4
D	184	32.3	110	38.0
E	27	4.7	7	2.4
F	7	1.2	1	.3
G	66	11.6	36	12.4
Total	570	100.0	290	100.0

*Expenditure Categories

A. Library Resources and Other Instructional Materials
B. Instructional Equipment and Minor Remodeling
C. Guidance, Counseling, and Testing
D. (A) and (B) above
E. (A) and (C) above
F. (B) and (C) above
G. (A), (B) and (C) above

[1] Non-public schools are not organized by district, but are included for the purposes of Title IV under the LEA in which the schools are geographically located.

Source: Data supplied by the New Jersey Department of Education, Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation

11. Assurance of Distribution of Funds and Maintenance of Effort (Annual Program Plan, pp. 36-39)

In the Program Plan, the SEA assured that funds received would be distributed among LEAs according to enrollments in their public and non-public schools.

The SEA also assured that the aggregate amount to be expended by the State and its local educational agencies from non-federal sources would not be less than the amount expended for IV-B related programs in the preceding fiscal year.

Documentation

A summary of SEA maintenance of effort shows a State total for FY 1975-76 of $91,302,141 and for FY 76-77 of $98,550,603 (IV-B-11). These figures compare favorably with the FY 1976 totals.

On a per pupil expenditure basis, maintenance of effort was also established. For FY 1976, $59.40 was spent per student, while in FY 1977 this was increased to $64.02.

C. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROCESS

For the most part, the program requirements of Title IV-B appear to have been met in New Jersey in FY 1977. Documentary evidence amply demonstrates that the SEA fulfilled all of the procedural steps outlined in the Annual Program Plan. These included:

- collecting enrollment and financial data for public and non-public schools

- developing and implementing criteria for appropriate distribution of funds, including a formula to compensate districts with a greater financial burden
- the preparation of an application form with detailed instructions for local school personnel
- developing a method for notifying LEAs of their per-pupil allotment by computer print-out
- providing technical assistance to LEAs, through initial orientation workshops and continuing communication with district personnel requesting aid
- assuring local discretion in the use of IV-B funds
- assuring equitable distribution of funds, maintenance of effort on the state level in the aggregate amount expended
- providing LEAs with a single application in two parts for IV-B and IV-C funds
- assuring maintenance of effort for aggregate expenditures for Title IV-B

Several administrative procedures were found to be particularly effective:

1) Part B Allocation Formulas. This complex set of formulas appears to respond to the letter and the spirit of the legislation. The formulas have been cited by the U.S. Office of Education and adopted or adapted by other states.

2) Efforts to Involve School Districts. The Department was able to provide funds to 570 school districts during FY 1977, an increase of thirty-five over FY 1976. A second application opportunity was extended to all districts which did not apply originally and seven new districts were funded.

3) Non-public School Involvement. Ninety-seven percent of all eligible districts participated in Title IV-B in FY 1977 and 94 percent

of all non-public schools also participated. The Department took several steps to extend Title IV-B dollars to all eligible districts and non-public schools. The results of the on-site evaluation indicate that there is appropriate non-public school involvement.

4) Communication with districts and with appropriate school officials regarding the availability of Title IV-B funds was more effective in FY 1977 than in FY 1976. It is likely that the newness of the Program in FY 1976 was the major impediment to timely and accurate communication. The Program is known more widely after two years of operation.

5) The on-site evaluation report indicates that project management at the district level was above average with respect to such fiscal requirements as separation of accounts, management of funds, and labeling of equipment and materials. Overall management of the projects (e.g., preparing reports and monitoring) was also rated as above average (IV-B-2).

In terms of process improvements during FY 1978, some consideration should be given to increasing the size of the sample for on-site interviews. A U.S. Office of Education Discussion Guide advises that "an evaluation scheme should be developed so that Part B projects in every participating LEA will be evaluated more thoroughly within a reasonable period of time (IV-B-13). Given that sample sizes in FY 1976 and 1977 have averaged about thirty-five districts, the Department may wish to consider increasing the size of the sample for the FY 1978 evaluation.

Measuring impact of Title IV-B (a topic to be addressed in the next section) is not likely to be entirely possible over the short term. The same Discussion Guide recommends that when Part B funds are linked to

long or short-range plans for educational improvement, the task of assessment will be easier. This advice is in line with a recommendation made in the FY 1976 evaluation report.[1]

The Department is advocating the use of Part B funds to support T&E efforts but, given that most districts are in the early stages of the process, it may be too early to expect a link between Part B and T&E. The predominant mode of allocating Part B funds within a district is on a per pupil basis. Such a procedure dilutes the already meager funds which are available to most LEAs and makes impact assessment more difficult.

The Annual Program Plan does not require LEAs to evaluate their projects although each district is required to be accountable for its use of the funds. Determining the impact of Part B funds on student learning is impeded by the relatively small size of the grant for many districts. Were valid and reliable impact measures available, it appears that the cost of employing them might not be worth the value of the information.

D. ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

While it is possible to identify outcomes for the Title IV-B Program and for each of the projects, it is difficult to assess the impact of Program or project activities on student or teacher behavior. Even in those cases where Part B funds are used in support of another project's objectives, it would be difficult to assess the unique contribution of those funds to the impact of the larger project. For example, it is

[1] Statewide Evaluation of E.S.E.A. Title IV in New Jersey for Fiscal Year 1976, Education and Public Affairs, September 30, 1976.

possible to identify the outcomes of Title IV-B expenditures in terms of library materials and equipment. It is much more difficult to assess the impact of the materials and equipment on student learning.

In terms of Title IV-B outcomes, the on-site evaluation studies indicate that the funds are spent to purchase needed materials in support of an on-going or new project or program. Districts tend not to use the funds for testing, counseling, and guidance programs. The expenditures by category for non-public schools nearly parallel those of the public schools.

As evidenced by the on-site evaluation studies, local discretion has not resulted in frivolous allocation of funds, although it appears to be the case that the targeting of the limited funds to a particular school or program demonstrates more measurable impact. Meaningful integration with the local T&E process also appears to enhance impact. Finally, maintenance of effort for state and local districts does not appear to be impeded. During FY 1976 and 1977, New Jersey has been able to exceed maintenance of effort requirements.

In an attempt to provide more useful information regarding processes, outcomes, and impacts, a structured interview schedule was used in on-site visits by a trained team of interviewers. The interview guide contained questions addressing such areas as developing the proposals, integration of the IV-B project with T&E, allocation processes, project outcomes and impact, administrative procedures, and Department of Education services. As a means of providing an assessment of outcomes of the Title IV-B Program, the following summary statements taken from the On-Site Evaluation Report are provided.

1) The needs identification processes used by districts vary considerably. In most cases, one or two individuals in the central office made a determination of the area in which funds would be used. The specifics of spending the money often were developed by a small group of teachers or principals.

2) The majority of districts undertook a proposal development process which was judged adequate by the interviewer.

3) The quality of the non-public school involvement was rated adequate or above for those districts having non-public schools.

4) The most frequently used word for describing the proposal development process was "meaningful."

5) A substantial majority of the districts are involved in either the first or second steps of the T&E process (i.e., goal setting or standard setting). This would appear to inhibit integration of IV-B with T&E at these early stages of development.

6) In only a small number of instances (5/38) were IV-B objectives fully derived from the districts' T&E objectives.

7) The allocation of funds to Program areas by the sample paralleled that for the total number of districts (see p. III-10). This would appear to validate the representativeness of the sample.

8) Thirty of the thirty-eight districts allocated IV-B monies on a per pupil basis.

9) While project administrators could identify the tangible outcomes of the use of the funds (e.g., materials or equipment now in use where they were not available previously), questions of impact on student or teacher behavior rarely were addressed. Local project directors

generally are not disposed to think of Part B in terms of student impact. The Department does not require impact evaluation.

10) All project administrators reported that they would achieve the objectives specified in the proposal. Their objectives generally were written in terms of simple process requirements such as, "purchase appropriate library materials." In one or two instances, objectives were at the other end of the continuum (e.g., raising the reading performance levels of all elementary school children through the purchase of $1000 of books).

11) Administrative procedures were rated as more than adequate or excellent for all projects.

12) Those districts that used available Department of Education Part B services rated them as excellent in the majority of cases (16/23).

These observations appear to support the judgment made by the on-site interview team in their report completed during FY 1976. Quantifiable data on impact is not available. Nevertheless, the judgment of all members of the team is that the money is having an impact commensurate with its size.

E. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE PLANNING

The FY 1976 evaluation report[2] made six recommendations for improving the administration of the Title IV-B Program. The Department's responses to each of them is reviewed here prior to offering some suggestions for improvements in the FY 1978 Program.

The FY 1976 plan suggested that the Department encourage districts to link IV-B expenditures to T&E and to encourage focusing expenditure

[2] Ibid.

on particular projects, schools or grade levels. In both cases the Department has advocated such approaches in its orientation workshops. Nevertheless, local autonomy in both areas is guaranteed by the federal legislation and it is not likely that the Department will be successful in the short term in realizing either of these objectives.

A third recommendation was that the Department disseminate descriptions of exemplary projects to LEAs. Such dissemination might provide models of good practice for other districts in the State. In FY 1977, the Department did identify five exemplary projects and these projects were given awards at the annual Educational Development Conference (IV-B-12).

The FY 1976 report also recommended that the Department investigate reasons for the relatively limited use of Part B funds for guidance, counseling, and testing. No such analysis has been undertaken during FY 1977, although several factors would appear to explain the phenomenon. A few possible explanations are:

1) the title of the Program (Libraries and Learning Resources)
2) insufficient funding in a large number of districts
3) staff procurement red tape (relating to guidance and counseling)
4) relative ease of using IV-B monies in other categories

The Department was advised to design guidelines for local evaluation of IV-B projects. No such design work was undertaken. Nevertheless, it is possible that some simple format and examples might be prepared for dissemination.

Finally, the FY 1976 evaluation report advocated that the Department broaden the distribution of notification of applications for IV-B funds. It is apparent from the level of involvement that adequate communication is now taking place.

Based on a review of Title IV-B administrative processes and on the Report of Findings of On-Site Evaluations, the following suggestions are made:

1) Formalize the selection of Title IV-B exemplary projects using the entire population of projects from which the selection is made. Self-nomination may be an appropriate way to narrow the field. Adapting some of the procedures used for reviewing Title IV-C projects may be a means of transferring some of the clarity and accountability of the Title IV-C process to the best IV-B projects.

2) Broaden the dissemination effort for Part B exemplary projects. Consider using publications and presentations at orientation sessions and workshops in addition to the awards presentation at the Educational Development Conference. Disseminate information about projects that focus IV-B monies on special projects or target populations or which are integrated with the LEA T&E process.

3) Provide LEAs with a wide range of sample objectives which are meaningful and useful. Suggest ways in which simple assessment techniques can be used to ascertain whether the money is being well spent. At the State level, consider the use of a select number of carefully developed case studies to illustrate the variety of exemplary uses to which IV-B funds can be directed.

SECTION IV

TITLE IV-C

EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

A. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of Title IV-C, Educational Innovation is to provide for the development and dissemination of innovative and exemplary programs and practices addressed to the priority educational needs of the State and local school districts. While most ESEA programs focus on particular student populations, Title IV-C, Educational Innovation focuses on the development of solutions to important school problems. A portion (15 percent) of IV-C monies are targeted to the development of innovations for addressing the needs of handicapped children.

Title IV-C represents an innovative approach to development in that solutions to school problems are designed, tested, and validated by practitioners in schools. This is in contrast to the research and development activities conducted by national Educational Laboratories and Centers and by institutions of higher education. The hypothesis is that practitioner-developed programs and practices will be more readily adopted and adapted by other school districts than those resulting from research and development in settings other than LEAs.

By facilitating the diffusion of validated programs and practices to other school districts in the country, Title IV-C monies can be used more efficiently, reducing the cost per child of the development expenses.

At the federal level, the Joint Dissemination Review Panel in the Education Division reviews the best of the development outcomes and provides resources for diffusing the exemplary ones. At the state level, IV-C resources are used to diffuse state validated programs.

Building on the activities and accomplishments of ESEA, Title III, Title IV-C has expanded the quantity and quality of programs available to address important school management and learning problems. The Title IV-C Program in New Jersey is attempting to promote such expansion and improvement throughout the State.

Fiscal year (FY) 1977 was the first year of full implementation of the IV-C, Educational Innovation Program. The old Title III and the new Title IV-C operated concurrently in FY 1976. The FY 1977 Program is a continuation of those IV-C activities begun in FY 1976. For this reason, the evaluation of this component builds upon that done in FY 1976, supplementing new material where appropriate.

Evaluation Questions

Evaluation of Title IV-C is directed at acquiring evidence to answer three basic questions:

- To what degree has the process for conducting and managing Title IV-C as projected in the Annual Plan actually been carried out during the year?
- To what extent is the process itself likely to enhance or retard accomplishment of desired Title IV-C outcomes?
- To what extent have outcome objectives for Title IV-C actually been achieved?

Evaluation Methodology

The Annual Program Plan for Title IV-C for FY 1977 was reviewed and compared with that for FY 1976 in order to identify new objectives or

activities for the Program. All process requirements described in the FY 1977 Plan were identified. For each process requirement, documentation and other evidence was sought to establish that the process requirements had been addressed. Finally a judgment of quality was made regarding the manner and form in which the requirements were met.

Also, since this was the second year in which an evaluation of the IV-C Program was conducted, recommendations from that evaluation were reviewed and evidence was sought as to what had been done in response to the recommendations.

The text of this Section is organized to follow the FY 1977 Plan. Page references to the Plan are provided.

B. ADHERENCE TO THE PLAN

1. State Priorities and Objectives (Annual Program Plan, p. 42)

The Department implemented a "discrepancy" analysis, relating current student performance levels to the statewide educational goals, as a means of establishing needs to which education programs should be addressed. Educational priorities for FY 1977 were established.

Documentation

Between 1970 and 1972, the New Jersey State Board of Education conducted an "Our Schools" project, a needs assessment involving broad citizen participation to arrive at a set of formalized statewide goals for public education. The goals were adopted by the state board on April 12, 1972, and have represented since then the basic educational priorities for the State. The Title IV-C Program is directed as well to these goals.

The New Jersey educational priorities for FY 1976 derived from an analysis of the discrepancy between goals and assessment data. This analysis, together with the goals and assessment data, are found in Appendix IV-C-1 (pp. 43-64). The assessment data base is the same as that used in FY 1976 but is updated through trend analysis by the Department of Education.

The Title IV Advisory Council reviewed and reaffirmed the critical priorities and added a requirement that a basic skills RFP be developed to solicit proposals in the area of mathematics skills development (IV-C-1, p. 65).

The New Jersey Guidelines for Title IV-C, distributed to all districts, incorporated the priority areas for educational development in the State. Listed are six "critical" priorities and four additional "important" ones. Four of the ten represent distinct urban needs; four others represent both urban and non-urban educational needs (IV-C-2).

Two organizational priorities were established for the Department of Education:

a) Decentralization to improve service and ensure "thorough and efficient."

b) Reorganization of Department of Education to ensure service (IV-C-1, p. 68).

2. Development of Part C Application Component (Annual Program Plan, p. 69)

Guidelines will be designed to move districts toward the critical educational needs of the State.

Documentation

Both the Title IV-C Guidelines and the Program Announcement provided direction for the development efforts to be supported by IV-C. Two Program Announcements were sent to local districts during FY 1977. The first (IV-C-3) used the Request for Proposals (RFP) process to move districts to address the need for validated programs in the area of basic skills mathematics.

Because an insufficient number of fundable proposals was submitted in response to the first Program Announcement, the State Advisory Council requested the Department to reopen the application period. This exceptional circumstance was authorized by the U.S. Office of Education (IV-B-9).

A second Program Announcement (IV-C-4) in the Spring of 1977 contained an RFP for supplemental center services on a multi-district basis. All applications were rated according to the degree to which they addressed State priorities. Appendix IV-C-5 contains a description of the newly selected projects and the priority of each addressed. Table IV-1 presents a synopsis of the priorities of new projects.

3. Equitable Distribution of Funds Among LEAs (Annual Program Plan, p. 68)

Technical assistance will be provided to all districts requesting it.

Documentation

Technical assistance was provided to all districts requesting it before applications were submitted for review. A series of workshops was held in four sites to help district staff decide if their idea was appropriate for Part C support. An additional session was provided during each workshop to assist applicant districts in stating their ideas as clearly as possible. Districts were encouraged to send a draft of their proposals to the IV-C

TABLE IV-1

Synopsis of Priorities

Addressed by New Projects

Priority Area	Priority Rank	Number of New Projects Addressing Priority
Basic Skills	1	5
Social Relationships	2	2
Producer/Consumer	3	2
Health	4	0
Basic Information	5	5
Citizenship	6	1
Family Life	7	0
Creativity	8	1
Learning Process	9	2
Ethics	10	0
Self-Worth	11	0
T&E*	--	2
		TOTAL 20**

*T&E is not a priority in the same sense as the others but is an overall mechanism for school improvement activities.

**The fourteen projects addressed more than one priority.

Project Center prior to the workshop so that they could be critiqued. Project Center staff used forms to rate each draft for clarity and consistency (IV-C-6). Follow-up assistance was provided to all districts wishing help in preparing subsequent drafts.

4. Review and Approval of Proposals (Annual Program Plan, p. 69)

Three or more experts from outside the Department will review and critique each application and make recommendations for or against its approval. Those recommendations will then be reviewed by the State Advisory Council and forwarded to the Chief State School Officer. The LEA and non-public schools will be notified of the Council's action; if favorable, the terms of the grant will be implemented.

Documentation

Reviewers from outside the Department were chosen on the basis of broad educational background which included (1) familiarity with current programs and needs in a wide variety of content areas, at all levels of the K-12 system; (2) knowledge of the development process used by the Department; (3) ability to analyze written information against established criteria; and (4) the variety of viewpoints they bring to the selection process (e.g., curriculum development, teacher preparation or school management). In addition, reviewers of validation applications were familiar with evaluation procedures and instruments. A synopsis of the background of a sample of this year's outside reviewers appears in Appendix IV-C-7.

The review and approval process was conducted in five steps:

a) Preliminary Selection. The Stage I review group was composed of reviewers from outside the Department, all of whom had broad backgrounds in the fields of education. Stage I reviewers were given a description of

the overall review process and the forms used for the review (IV-C-8). Two types of information on each project resulted from the Stage I review: a numerical rating representing a reviewer's judgment of the quality of the idea described; and a reviewer's decision to either consider the project further or drop it from competition (IV-C-9).

b) Formal Selection for Funding. The Stage II review process which included members of the State Advisory Council is described in Appendix IV-C-9. As a result of reviews during Stage II, fourteen new applications were recommended for funding.

c) Recommending Applications to the Selection Subcommittee of the State Advisory Council. All applications and reviewers' comments were available for review. Staff members were queried as to the outside reviewers' assessment of specific applications. A synopsis of each project along with information or rankings and the rationale and conditions for support was prepared for the Advisory Council. Based on this information, the Subcommittee recommended approval to the full Advisory Council of the Stage II recommendations.

d) Advisory Council Approval. The full Advisory Council reviewed and approved the selections in accordance with established priorities.

e) Commissioner Approval. The final list was sent to the Commissioner who accepted the Council's recommendations.

5. Private Non-Profit School Participation (Annual Program Plan, p. 71)

Private non-profit schools are expected to participate either by submitting their own applications through the public schools; or by becoming

involved cooperatively with the public schools in a problem they both have identified, in accordance with Section 406 of the Act.

- Each LEA receiving IV-C funds will provide for equitable, effective participation by children enrolled in private schools in the area it served.
- Each LEA application under Title IV-C will include information on the number of private schools in the area the project will serve; how representatives for those schools participated in developing the proposal; and the information to assure that equitable services are provided.

Documentation

As part of its program plan for each year, each district was required to document that non-public schools were asked to participate in the project and how they will be involved. Appendix IV-C-3 (p. 3) is the section from the 1975-76 program plan which requires this information.

As part of the plan, districts were required to specify the number of public and private school children to be included in field test activities (IV-C-10). To date, all private schools wishing to participate in Title IV-C funded projects have been able to do so.

Appendix IV-C-11 provides sample correspondence between project developers or project directors and non-public school administrators, and vice-versa, documenting the invitations extended to non-public school personnel.

One hundred eighty-seven (187) applications were received in response to the two grant solicitations during FY 1977. Of that number, fifty-eight districts had no non-public schools within their geographic region. Of the remaining 129, sixty-six (51 percent) applications presented documentation of their efforts to include non-public schools in the planning of their proposals. One project application was initiated solely by a non-public

school. Each of the fourteen funded districts had accommodated the appropriate non-public schools in the development of the proposal (IV-C-12).

6. Procedures for Evaluating Projects (Annual Program Plan, p. 2)

Individual project effectiveness will be determined by on-site evaluation methods conducted by the State. Annual on-site evaluations will be conducted by an outside impartial observer. Qualified independent on-site evaluators will be used to determine project effectiveness.

Documentation

To receive continuing funding for a second or third year development or dissemination project, districts with Title IV-C grants must provide information showing that progress toward accomplishment of objectives is being made. This information, accompanying the application for continuation funding, was given serious review as a basis for approval.

During FY 1977, fifty-six Title IV-C projects were under way and applied for development or dissemination continuation in FY 1978. On-site evaluations were conducted during the year, using thirty-three on-site evaluation specialists.

Of the thirty-three consultants used, fourteen were classified as research or evaluation specialists and nineteen were subject matter specialists.

The thirty-three evaluation specialists were drawn in largest numbers from the universities (42 percent); eight came from public schools (24 percent). The remainder were predominantly private consultants.

It should be noted that projects seeking validation receive on-site evaluation visits, the reports of which are used in lieu of the New Jersey system outlined above. Those projects which have completed development and are not eligible for validation are not visited.

A copy of the "Manual for On-Site Evaluators," including the method for rating projects and a copy of the Project Evaluation Report used, are included as Appendix IV-C-13 and C-14.

On-site evaluations of development projects were completed by the first week in April. By the second week in April, copies of these evaluations were available to the project directors. On-site evaluations for dissemination projects were completed by the first week in May and reports were made available to the process consultants by May 15. The reports were reviewed by both parties for possible incorporation of recommendations into the following year's proposal (IV-C-15). Sample end-of-year reports containing evaluation data are included in Appendix IV-C-16.

7. On-Site Monitoring of Local Projects (Annual Program Plan, pp. 75 and 21)

A State Department representative will visit each project at least three times a year to assure that the project is on schedule and performing as described.

Documentation

Appendix IV-C-17 contains samples of visitation logs maintained by the process consultants. The logs contain information on project personnel visited, reasons for visit, problems discussed, actions taken and a rating of the progress the project is making in accordance with the approved project plan.

The visitation logs indicate that projects are visited at least three times a year and that the visits often result in the resolution of problems such as time delays, scheduling and inadequate project planning.

8. Local Project Evaluation by LEAs (Annual Program Plan, p. 77)

All Title IV-C plans will require an evaluation.

Documentation

Project evaluation criteria developed by the State Department of Education for submission by local districts are found in Appendix IV-C-18. The criteria cover such elements as scope, relevance, flexibility, feasibility, reliability, objectivity, representativeness, timeliness, pervasiveness, ethical considerations, and protocol. Each element is defined by several questions with appropriate scales.

9. Technical Assistance to LEAs (Annual Program Plan, p. 78)

During project development, assistance will be provided by EICs* and SEA staff, in the form of workshops and individual consultation.

Documentation

The Project Center was staffed to provide technical assistance to projects in five areas: planning, evaluation, materials development, program implementation, and dissemination strategies. The procedures used to provide technical assistance were similar to those used in classrooms where teachers provide individualized instruction. At the beginning of their development of dissemination stages, projects were brought together for group presentations of information pertinent to all of them. The last

*As used in this Report, the Educational Improvement Centers (EICs) refer to the State-managed intermediate unit supported with State aid and other administrative funds. On occasion, school districts will apply for funds under the Supplemental Center category and "attach" these projects to the EIC. EICs also received Title IV-C, Strengthening SEA funds and administrative funds during FY 1977 to perform the technical assistance activities described in this Section.

part of these sessions consisted of individual conferences, where the needs and problems of the individual projects were discussed and next steps were determined.

Technical assistance thereafter was mostly provided on a project-by-project basis, depending on the needs of each project. Staff members, assigned to each project as process consultants, provided assistance during project implementation and were responsible for seeing that the projects to which they were assigned received other forms of assistance as needed. The group meetings held during this past year included an introductory session for newly selected projects, an introductory session for all projects approved for dissemination and a workshop on materials production for those validated projects which needed to prepare materials for their dissemination programs.

Educational Improvement Centers (EIC), intermediate resource centers established by the Department to provide technical assistance to school districts, provided an additional resource for assistance to projects. EICs most frequently gave assistance in the areas of program planning and design (examples: a training program for project staff on how to develop a curriculum,and training in project management techniques); locating background information (research reports, other programs in the same content area); evaluation design and content information (particularly in the areas of special education, programs for the gifted, and individualization of instruction).

10. State Leadership and Professional Staff Development Activities (Annual Program Plan, p. 9)

As determined from experience, staff development was most needed in planning and implementation of field test activities. On-the-job training

was to be provided by teaming experienced with inexperienced staff members. In addition, the Department was to continue to provide a series of training sessions on T&E, the comprehensive planning and evaluation process for all districts.

Documentation

The staff members with the least experience are the process consultants; consequently most of the staff training activities this year were directed toward this group. Much of the training occurred as part of the everyday work of the office. Each project was assigned both a process consultant and a planner, who was experienced in working with projects through the planning, design, and field test stages. Problems and decisions regarding projects were discussed jointly so that process consultants would become familiar with federal regulations and state procedures and with techniques which have proven effective in the past for solving particular problems.

A formal training session for process consultants was held in June. The training session, conducted by a consulting firm which had worked with a number of Title III projects in the past, focused on project management. The session served a dual purpose: process consultants learned about management techniques and problems, and in turn taught project directors the techniques they had learned (IV-C-19).

11. In-Service Training for LEA Staff (Annual Program Plan, p. 79)

Training needs among LEAs, assessed from previous years, will include understanding and skills in research, evaluation and planning, and implementing strategies.

Documentation

Much of the training provided to LEAs took place as part of the technical assistance provided to districts.

A more formal training workshop which focused on project management, however, took place in FY 1977. Most of the participants were directors of projects in their first year or other people who would benefit from the training. Approximately twenty district people were trained. The training sessions were led by the process consultants with assistance from outside consultants. In future years, the process consultants will be able to conduct this training session for new project staff on their own. The agenda for this training program is given in Appendix IV-C-19.

In January, 1977, the second annual Educational Development Conference was held. All project directors were invited to attend a series of workshops on such topics as the National Diffusion Network, Local and State Program Evaluation, and T&E Update. Validated projects were recognized. Presentations were made by Dr. Thomas Burns, Associate Commissioner for State and Local Educational Programs and Dr. Fred G. Burke, Commissioner.

12. Provisions for Continuing or Terminating Projects (Annual Program Plan, pp. 81-2)

Continuation plans will be reviewed for approval or possible termination on the basis of on-site evaluator or expeditor reports.

Documentation

Of projects in their first or second year which submitted continuation proposals for FY 1977, five were terminated. Four were development projects, while one was in dissemination. Reasons for termination included

failing to meet objectives or, in the case of the dissemination project, a falling off of demand for the project.

Between 1972 and 1976, twenty-nine projects were terminated when they did not meet, or were considered not likely to be able to meet, their specified goals and objectives.

Considerations in whether or not to approve a continuation plan included:

- The reasonableness of the time frame, e.g., was it possible to show results if the time required actually to introduce and implement the project in its first year was inadequate? In this case, however, was project implementation on schedule?
- The possibility that goals and objectives can be met in a subsequent year if specified changes in program design are made
- Are fiscal procedures sound?

13. Ratio of Funding Between Development and Dissemination (Annual Program Plan, pp. 89-90)

It is anticipated that one-third of the available funds will be needed for development and two-thirds for dissemination.

Documentation

Of the $2,273,058 expended in FY 1977, 43 percent was spent on development projects and 57 percent was spent on dissemination projects.

14. Assurance, Fund Distribution (Annual Program Plan, p. 91)

Funds under Part C will be distributed equitably among local agencies on a competitive basis, with assistance given to those LEAs less able to compete because of size or local financial resources.

Documentation

All districts were given full opportunity to compete for Title IV-C funds. Announcements of the competition were distributed to all districts; workshops were conducted to stimulate participation and provide instruction in completing applications; and technical assistance was provided on an individualized basis, both before submission of applications and after their receipt, to assist in building up their quality and competitiveness. (See documentation for Equitable Distribution of Funds Among LEAs, p. IV-5, above.)

Evidence that assistance provided by the Department is having a positive effect on the distribution of funds is provided by an analysis of the awards made during FY 1977. Half of the funds distributed went to projects in poorer districts (IV-C-22). Of the twenty-eight urban aid cities, ten were awarded grants. Fourteen of the thirty-five development projects funded were in these ten districts (IV-C-23).

15. Criteria for Fund Distribution (Annual Program Plan, p. 92)

The major criteria used in judging IV-C applications will be distributed with the applications to the local districts.

Documentation

A publication entitled "Guidelines for ESEA, Title IV, Part C, Public Law 93-380, The Amendments of 1974 to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1976-77" was distributed along with applications to all districts. The criteria for judging applications appeared as Appendix D to that publication (IV-C-2).

16. Provision of Technical Services (Annual Program Plan, p. 93)

The State and EICs will reinforce and extend local capability to initiate innovative and exemplary programs and activities through meetings, workshops, conferences, and published materials.

Documentation

Provision of technical services permeated the entire New Jersey process designed for Title IV-C.

- Technical assistance was employed to encourage and prepare districts to initiate applications for IV-C funds. (See Equitable Distribution of Funds Among LEAs, p. IV-5, above.)
- Guidelines were published and disseminated to provide instructions for applying the criteria by which applications would be judged (IV-C-2).
- During project development, assistance was provided by EICs and SEA staff in the form of workshops and individual consultation. (See Technical Assistance to LEAs, p. IV-12, above.)
- In-service training, particularly in management of IV-C projects, was conducted for LEAs. (See In-Service Training for LEA Staff, p. IV-14, above.)
- Dissemination activities included publication of manuals for ten validated projects; publication of numerous feature articles in Interact (IV-C-24) and statewide and national distribution of some twelve thousand copies of Educational Projects That Work (Appendix IV-C-25). This information is based only on a report of dissemination activities for July to December, 1976. Information for the last half of the fiscal year remains to be accumulated and published in report form.

17. Identification and Validation of Proven Practices (Annual Program Plan, p. 94-5)

Through development of an evaluation design that will yield statistical results; monitoring by staff three times yearly; visits by trained evaluators;

and a final year-end report, the state will identify practices and programs that work, are cost-effective, and are exportable.

Projects that are validated as successful, cost effective, and exportable are nominated for validation by the USOE Dissemination Review Panel, by the State's IVD (Identification, Validation and Dissemination) process, and/or other appropriate validating groups.

Documentation

A table, listing for FY 1977 the number of projects completing development and the number successfully completing the IVD process, appears as Appendix IV-C-26. No national validations were achieved during FY 1977. Five were validated through the State IVD process. Since 1973, thirty projects have been validated through the State process, with ten of those also validated at the national level.

18. Provisions for Dissemination (Annual Program Plan, p. 95)

The State will transfer locally validated projects to impact more widely through its statewide dissemination program. To aid in dissemination, the State and its EICs will give materials, training, and technical assistance to potential adopters.

Documentation

Appendix IV-C-27 presents a table showing, by project (up to the end of calendar year 1976), its validation status, whether statewide (IVD) or national (JRDP). In addition it shows by project the model by which consumer adoption was facilitated.

The consumer adoption models used (in some instances, more than one model was used) to aid dissemination were as follows:

Producer-consumer	11
Commercial distribution	1
Turnkey distribution	10
National Diffusion Network	10

Each project had an individual plan based on the foregoing models usually involving training, awareness, involvement, and other elements.

19. Evaluation of Statewide Dissemination Efforts (Annual Program Plan, pp. 99-100)

Information for evaluation of the statewide dissemination plan will be acquired.

Documentation

Appendix IV-C-28 shows for the first half of FY 1977, by project, the number of adoptions in New Jersey and other states and the number of turnkey trainers trained in New Jersey and other states. Of nineteen projects ready for dissemination, twelve were adopted in other New Jersey districts. Of eighty-eight adoptions, Project ACTIVE alone was adopted in as many as thirty-two districts. Eight of the projects were adopted by other states (a total of 129 adoptions). The Institute for Political and Legal Education Project was adopted or adapted in sixty districts in other states. Thirty-nine turnkey trainers were trained for nine projects in New Jersey, and twenty-four for other states. In the past four years, these New Jersey validated projects have been disseminated to 727 districts. Approximately two-thirds of all New Jersey districts have adopted at least one of these programs.

20. State's Strategy to Encourage Adoptions (Annual Program Plan, p. 100)

- The state will conduct workshops on development, where emphasis will be given to continuation of completed IV-C projects at the developing district and to subsequent dissemination to other districts.

- The state will prepare and distribute a catalog of successful programs that have statewide dissemination plans and place materials on these programs in ERIC and in teacher training colleges.

Documentation

Through workshops and other dissemination activities, of eighty-two projects which completed development between 1972 and 1977 seventy-nine were continued at the local level with the district's own funds.

The State took multiple opportunities to introduce the concept of dissemination in connection with Title IV-C. At the initial workshop dealing with the selection process for the program, dissemination was discussed as part of the intent of the legislation and a valued end-product in awarding the grant. Dissemination is further reinforced at introductory sessions for newly selected projects and as a significant element in the yearly on-site evaluations.

During the year, an Educational Development Conference was conducted at which all newly validated projects were honored. All districts were invited and their representatives became aware of the projects in terms of their potential value for themselves.

As a means of encouraging adoptions of validated projects, the State published information about its validated projects in a document entitled Educational Programs That Work, a catalog of demonstration sites of successful education programs (IV-C-25). Section I of the publication describes twenty-eight successful programs whose staffs offer complete

dissemination services and materials to interested educators. Section II describes an additional three successful programs whose materials may be ordered. Section III describes eleven nationally validated projects developed in other states and implemented in New Jersey.

In addition, information about successful programs has been placed in numerous locations, to reach teachers, administrators, and the public (IV-C-29).

While not specifically projected in the Annual Program Plan, the State developed during this fiscal year a series of publications to aid districts in development or to advance adoption of validated projects. They are listed below.

1. Guidelines for Writing Manuals
2. Dissemination Applications 1976-77
3. Educational Programs That Work
4. Manual for Project Administration
5. Guidelines and Forms for Preparing the 1977 Program Plan

C. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROCESS

An analysis of the process used by the Department of Education in its administration of the Title IV-C Program indicates that requirements were met in an exemplary fashion.

The data on which priorities are established is updated and the Advisory Council reaffirms funding priorities. The establishment of an RFP for math was an indication that the Council was responding to new information.

The reopening of the application period during the Spring of 1977 was not in violation of the single application requirement of the legislation. A federal directive from the U.S. Office of Education found such a reopening to be permissible as long as there was sufficient time remaining for the expenditure of the funds at the local level and the funds were made available to all districts on a competitive basis. The Department was in compliance with both requirements in its reopening of grant competition, and in doing so, was able to extend funding to more projects.

Technical assistance services continue to be of good quantity and quality. The Department uses a multi-method approach so as to address group and individual district needs. That the number of project applications grew in FY 1977 to 187 from 111 in FY 1976 is in part an indication of the encouragement and assistance provided by the Department to local districts.

The proposal review process appears sound and complete. The use of external reviewers, while not required by federal guidelines, provides a more impartial rating from carefully chosen experts. The involvement of State Advisory Council members in the review process also appears to be a commendable activity. By having the SAC members participate in the review process, the Department insures a joint decision-making process and facilitates the formal review process undertaken by the full Advisory Council.

Efforts by the Department to direct funds to poorer districts, while still maintaining the competitive nature of the granting process, have resulted in a higher concentration of funds in those districts than in wealthier, more able districts.

The use of a variety of incentives - from awareness information to awards and commendations - appears to result in an above average ratio of validated projects to the total number of development projects funded. Such activities as the Educational Development Conference are instrumental in maintaining New Jersey's status as a prime contributor to the pool of nationally validated projects. In addition to contributing to the national pool, the State uses its own IVD process to identify exemplary programs for dissemination to districts within the State.

In one instance, the Department's actions appear to be insufficient to meet the spirit of the legislation and the specific requirements of its own Title IV-C application process. Nearly half (49 percent) of the IV-C proposals submitted failed to provide documentation of efforts to include non-public schools in the planning of the proposal. All funded proposals did provide such documentation.

Although the project application requires that documentation of an invitation to non-public schools be appended to the application, many districts neglected to submit such documentation. This was the case despite the fact that a statement of assurances (one of which related to non-public school involvement) was signed by the local school superintendent.

Of the fourteen proposals funded by the Department, however, all provided evidence of having accommodated the appropriate non-public schools in planning the proposal. Thus, the Department is not supporting projects which are in non-compliance with the requirements.

In the process of analyzing evidence that the Department fulfilled process requirements of the Annual Program Plan, a small number of

observations were made which merit attention in addressing the requirements of subsequent years. Some of these observations were made in the FY 1976 evaluation report.[1]

1) Data Collection. The State Advisory Council Evaluation is designed as essentially an audit of Department-collected data. In some few instances, data collection content or format were changed, or specific data were not collected. Such changes make it difficult to build a longitudinal data base which is critical to the assessment of a Program such as Title IV. Examples of such data are Appendices IV-C-5D, IV-C-8, IV-C-12A,IV-C-17B, and IV-C-17C in the FY 1976 Report.[2]

2) Reports to the U.S. Office of Education. New Jersey's validated projects are still not being entered into the ERIC system. It would appear that this problem might be alleviated soon, since a national file for educational programs and practices is to be designed and implemented within the next year. Such a file would be comprised of projects such as those developed and validated in New Jersey.

D. ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

1. Projects will be continued with local funds, once Title IV funding concludes (Annual Program Plan, p. 22).

Documentation

A table showing, by fiscal year, the number of projects continued with local funding appears on page IV-26. Over the five years (1972-76)

[1]Statewide Evaluation of E.S.E.A. Title IV in New Jersey for Fiscal Year 1976, Education and Public Affairs, September 30, 1976.

[2]Ibid.

for which data were available, 82 projects completed development and 79 were continued.

Title IV-C Development Projects Continued with Local Funds after End of Federal Funding

FY	Validated-Continued	Non-Validated Continued
72	3	6a
73	4	10
74	9	16b
75	6 (3)d	12c
76	6	NA
77	5	8

a) one continued with other federal funds; one with non-Title IV-C state funds

b) two continued with non-Title IV-C state funds

c) one continued with non-Title IV-C state funds

d) (3) projects validated in FY 74; additional components validated later

2. Projects which were disseminated by the State will be adopted Annual Program Plan, p. 22).

Documentation

Of nineteen projects disseminated by the State in FY 1977, eighty-eight New Jersey districts and 129 out-of-state districts adopted them. Nearly complete information shows that approximately 252,344 New Jersey students and 6,939 teachers in New Jersey (duplicated counts) were affected by them (IV-C-30). Counting previous years, a total of 483 adoptions had taken place in New Jersey.

3. Student progress will occur as a result of a new Title IV-C project or the project will meet its stated goals (Annual Program Plan, p. 22).

Documentation

Based on rigorous evaluation design, projects are judged as to whether or not they have met the learning objectives initially established for them. When these objectives have been met, districts adopt them as part of their regular educational programs. In addition, they may be validated either by a state designed process (IVD) or by a National Diffusion Network process.

The following table shows by fiscal year, the number of projects which completed development and the number validated by each process.

Title IV-C Projects Awarded Validation

FY	Completed Development	No. Validated (IVD)	No. Validated (JDRP)
72	9	3	2
73	17	9	5
74	17	4	3
75	26	6 (3)a	2 (pending)
76	--	6	NA
77	13	5	--

a) (3) projects validated in FY 1974 but were being validated on additional components

4. Title IV-C projects awarded, completed and adopted in fiscal year 1976 will be related to priority educational goals and objectives.

Documentation

During FY 1976, of nine projects awarded, over half were in the top three priority areas. (See page IV-6 of this Report for table of priorities addressed by new projects.)

5. The Title IV-C project represented an innovative, cost-effective program in judgment of on-site evaluators and State Department of Education staff.

Documentation

Each project is given ratings by on-site evaluators following site visits, for innovativeness, effect or impact, cost-effectiveness and exportability. Appendix IV-C-31 shows the ratings on these four variables as well as the mean ratings for all projects for each of the four variables. On a scale of 5, project averages were 2.52 for innovativeness; 2.40 for effect; 2.62 for cost-effectiveness and 2.56 for exportability.

The on-site evaluation was given heavy weight in the final decision to continue projects, but knowledge derived from monitors' reports and the Project Center's experience with the project played a significant part as well.

E. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE PLANNING

The Title IV-C Program in New Jersey continues to be an exemplary state development effort. A substantial percent of funded projects continue to be validated and adopted by other districts in New Jersey and in the Country.

Of the five recommendations for strengthening the Program made in the FY 1976 evaluation, three appear to have been addressed in whole or in part during FY 1977. The reorganization of the IV-C Program has helped to address the workload problems which existed in FY 1976. Roles and responsibilities for all staff now are clearly defined and project review processes are on schedule.

The reorganization of the IV-C Program also brought about a stronger conceptualization of the role that Title IV-C should play in T&E. This integration of IV-C and T&E in the Department is being carried on down to the local level through the information conferences and workshops.

The suggestion that the Department press the U.S. Office of Education to enter all New Jersey IV-C validated projects into the ERIC system in order to effect the widest possible dissemination was not addressed during FY 1977. As was noted previously, however, a special national file is to be developed for programs and practices. Also, other dissemination activities employed by New Jersey and the National Diffusion Network appear to have been very successful in promoting adoptions and adaptations of the validated projects.

The suggestion that the Department consider the possibility of project design activities involving producer and consumer districts concurrently, making adaptations as needed to meet the requirements of both, seems to have been accepted wholeheartedly by the Department. A speech by Commissioner Burke at the Educational Development Conference in January, 1977 (IV-C-32), outlined the general features of a new development system based on this idea. The concept is presently being designed by the Department's staff in Research, Planning and Evaluation.

A recommendation relating to the continuation of detailed tracking of consumer districts in realizing achievement gains has not been addressed fully. This area is likely to be of increasing importance in the future.

Finally, the recommendation for the development of cost accounting and cost-benefit approaches to Title IV-C projects has not been addressed by the Department. This area also is likely to be of great importance in

the future. It is possible, however, that progress in this area will need to await advances in the use of such technology in the area of education.

Based on this review of FY 1977 efforts, the following suggestions are made for improving an already strong Program:

1. Improve and standardize where possible the data requirements and the data collection formats developed during FY 1976 and 1977. Changes should be made only where benefits in information utility will be increased substantially. Additional data requirements and formats should be added to the basic design as new information needs are identified.

2. Establish a review procedure which checks all submitted applications for compliance with requirements regarding non-public school participation in planning and implementation of IV-C projects. An inexpensive clerical review process would provide sufficient review.

3. Continue to track progress of consumer districts in achieving statistically significant gains for IV-C projects to match those of producer districts in adopting the new program in the new setting. Studies of the change process indicate that the process of implementation of an innovation involves a complex set of changes over a long period of time. The lack of extensive study in this area could provide an opportunity for the New Jersey Department of Education to extend its leadership in the area of innovation.

4. This same area of change (implementation) could also be addressed through continued pursuit of a joint development process among several districts. The "lighthouse" concept of innovation is only one

alternative for facilitating improvement in educational programs and practices. This area, also, is one in which the experience of Department staff might be put to use in designing new directions in development.

SECTION V

PROGRAM FOR STRENGTHENING LEADERSHIP RESOURCES OF

STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

A. INTRODUCTION

> . . . to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of their educational agencies, and to assist those agencies in the establishment and improvement of programs to identify and meet the educational needs of the States. (ESEA, Title V, Part A. Sec. 501 (2))

The purposes of the Program for Strengthening the Leadership Resources of State Education Agencies are stated best in the original legislative language established by Congress in 1965. The statement conveys the broad mandate of the legislation - states should use the Program's resources to stimulate new ventures, to address priority needs and to strengthen leadership resources. The Program is perhaps the most flexible of all grant programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education.

This Section is concerned with those "strengthening" activities undertaken by the New Jersey Department of Education during FY 1977. This year was marked by a continuation and refinement of objectives and activities initiated during FY 1976, the first year in which the Strengthening SEA Program was under the Title IV designation. Such continuation means that the major theme of the Program was the development and implementation of a "thorough and efficient" system of education in New Jersey as mandated by the State legislature. T&E, initiated during FY 1976, made considerable progress during FY 1977 and the Strengthening SEA Program was a major

resource used to prepare processes, products, and services for the Department, the Education Improvement Centers, the County Offices, and local school districts.

The Annual Program Plan for FY 1977 was addressed to six objectives in the areas of planning and evaluation, educational data information systems, dissemination, educational financing, and assistance to local education agencies. Each of the objectives was directed, in whole or in part, to implementing a "thorough and efficient" system of education.

This Section is organized around the five major areas. For each area, adherence to the Annual Program Plan is assessed by reviewing documentation of the conduct or completion of projected activities. Also, an assessment of the process used to address the areas/objectives is made and an assessment of outcomes is presented. A separate section discusses implications for future planning in the five areas.

Since the objectives established for FY 1977 are process oriented, the evaluation is primarily one of establishing that specific activities were undertaken and that those activities were of adequate scope and quality. Because ultimate impact is difficult to measure - particularly with the long-range development of a T&E educational system - the focus is principally on more proximate outcomes and indicators of accomplishment.

The evaluation of New Jersey's Strengthening SEA Program is based on: 1) documents describing accomplishments or activities; 2) products developed during FY 1977; and, 3) interviews with SEA staff engaged in activities supported by Title IV resources. A self-assessment instrument was prepared for use with all professional staff engaged in Strengthening

SEA activities. This instrument assisted in more uniform data collection and focused attention on outcome and impact questions (SEA-1). The narrative report that follows draws liberally on these data sources.

B. ADHERENCE TO PLAN

1. Planning and Evaluation

Two major objectives were established in the area of planning and evaluation:

- In order for the New Jersey State Department of Education (SEA) to accomplish its efforts to provide each child with a "thorough and efficient" (T&E) education, the SEA, during FY 1976, will identify those educational problems, issues and needs in the State related to the delivery of services essential for children to receive a quality education (Annual Program Plan, p. 83).

- During FY 1976, the New Jersey SEA will develop a plan for the delivery of services designed to bridge the "gaps" identified in 1 above through a system of intermediate units (Annual Program Plan, pp. 83-4).

Documentation

The objectives were focused on setting up a system of needs identification and on developing a plan for addressing the identified needs. The context for these activities was T&E, the requirement that quality educational services be provided to all children.

During FY 1977, the Department established the Office of Planning Research. This Office was created as a result of the macro-planning-priority management system developed in FY 1976. The Office has as one of its major objectives the design of a planning system for Program and Support Services to meet T&E needs (SEA-2). The intent is to make such a system an integral

part of the planning processes used in the Department, particularly in those units responsible for services and activities related to T&E.

During FY 1977, several policy papers and studies were completed. These activities were addressed to significant educational problems or to the improvement of services for students who were not being adequately served. Major papers were developed in moral/civic education, teenage unemployment, television violence, attitudinal development, and career education (SEA-3).

A special planning project was established in early childhood education (ECE). Policy research papers were prepared in several areas related to the development of new programs in ECE.

1) identifying and quantifying the need for services for young children in New Jersey
2) research into the effects of early educational intervention
3) models of disseminating research findings to early childhood educators
4) issues in accreditation of programs and professionals
5) exemplary programs in ECE (SEA-4)

The T&E legislation placed heavy responsibilities on the Department for providing support services to local school districts. This responsibility is extended to the County Offices and the Educational Improvement Centers.

The County Offices have the responsibility for seeing that all schools and districts meet the requirements for a thorough and efficient school

system pursuant to law and regulations. In fulfilling this role, they serve as the regulatory arm of the Department. The County Offices provide services to both the Department and to the local school districts within their respective areas. They assist the Office of Management Information in collecting and maintaining data which informs administrative policy and action with respect to T&E. The County Offices assist local districts in interpreting mandates and regulations, particularly those requirements related to T&E (SEA-5). Some specific activities of County Office personnel with respect to T&E are:

1. Provide assistance and supervision to assigned local schools and local school districts in the implementation of educational process plans, educational programs, and other operational standards required by State statute and regulations.

2. Prepare and disseminate materials necessary for local schools and school districts in conducting a comprehensive evaluation program.

3. Train school district administrators, supervisors, and coordinators in the program improvement process.

4. Plan with staff from target schools identified under the minimum standards program in order to analyze the problem, causes, solutions for deficiencies in basic skills as steps in the design of improvement programs.

5. Conduct training for local school and school district leaders regarding statutory and policy standards and procedures for maintaining a thorough and efficient system of education (SEA-1).

While the County Office provides regulatory services related to T&E, the Educational Improvement Centers (EIC) provide a broad range of program development services to local districts in their regions. The general structure of the EIC system was completed in FY 1977 with the establishment of a third and a fourth Center.

Much of FY 1977 was taken up with planning activities focused on developing both general and unique services for the EICs. A major product of the effort was the Regional Needs Inventory conducted by the Division of Research, Planning, and Evaluation in collaboration with the Branch of Regional Services in the Division of School Programs. The report was based on a survey of a sample of educators in every school district in the State.

The Inventory revealed that there was widespread agreement on the need in local schools and districts for additional technical assistance. Other high priority areas for EIC services were:

1) basic skills, particularly mathematics and metric education
2) planning, assessment and evaluation systems
3) in-service training for teachers (SEA-6)

The EICs have already begun to develop and offer services to address all or some of these needs.

2. Educational Data Information Systems

One objective was established for educational data information systems:

- To improve the SEA's capacity to provide valid, reliable and timely data to State, regional, and local educational planners (Annual Program Plan, p. 84).

Documentation

The major activity addressed to this objective during FY 1977 was the continued development of the Operational Planning System (OPS) for the Department of Education. The major purpose of the OPS is to insure a thorough and efficient operation of the Department of Education (SEA-1).

The planning process will include the County Offices and the EICs as well. The OPS, when fully operational, will provide information, accountability, and organizational development (SEA-7)

The OPS is intended as the mechanism for integrating major Department activities with T&E. Major components of the System are: 1) employee performance planning and appraisal; 2) quarterly planning and evaluation; 3) interagency implementation planning; and 4) a monthly reporting system. The design for the development of the FY 1978 Annual Operational Plan includes a specification of procedures, responsibilities, and products. Other activities responding to this objective were the continuation of information systems development and the preparation of statistical information for Department, regional and local use. In both areas, FY 1977 efforts were built upon foundations developed in FY 1976.

Informations systems development proceded through the implementation of standard operating procedures for collecting data from local education agencies (SEA-8). Approved instruments for data collection were developed and used in FY 1977 (SEA-9). A Data Dictionary for guiding all data collection was also completed during FY 1977 (SEA-10). The Department also prepared several statistical reports during FY 1977. These are contained in Appendix SEA-11.

3. Dissemination

One objective was established in the area of dissemination:

- During FY 1977, the New Jersey SEA will disseminate in a timely fashion information regarding SEA, intermediate units, and LEA progress and efforts toward initial thorough and efficient implementation (Annual Program Plan, p. 85).

Documentation

During FY 1977, the Department published nine issues of the New Jersey Interact, the major mass communications vehicle for the SEA. Several articles in the FY 1977 issues provided educators and interested lay groups with information on the progress of implementing T&E. Liaison to newspapers and radio and television stations was also maintained.

The September, 1976 issues of Interact provided the complete text of the Public School Education Act of 1975 (Chapter 212), the T&E legislation. This was provided in response to public demand for specifics about the Law (SEA-12). Also included was an article dealing with the reactions of political and educational institutions to the Robinson vs. Cahill judicial ruling which resulted in the T&E legislation.

The October, 1976 issue provided a brief bibliography of publications on T&E. The article described each publication and told of their availability to New Jersey residents (SEA-13).

The November, 1976 Interact issue presented two articles on T&E. The first reported on the development by the State PTA of guidelines for local PTAs regarding involvement in local T&E efforts. The second article presented a description of the activities of the West Morris Regional High School District in complying with T&E requirements (SEA-14).

Questions and answers on major elements of the T&E process were presented in the December Interact. T&E was explained generally and specific terms (e.g., goal indicators, standards, and basic skills) were defined (SEA-15).

In January, 1977, the procedures established by the State PTA for local PTA organizations to follow in getting involved in the development

of local T&E processes were printed in Interact. Eight major steps were recommended (SEA-16).

"T&E: The Law and the Citizen" was presented in the February Interact. The article, in both English and Spanish, was prepared by the Department and the New Jersey Congress of Parents and Teachers to help citizens understand the T&E process and the benefits it can produce.

"Town Meeting II" was also announced in the February, 1977 issue. This was a public television program during which the Commissioner and his staff answered questions from callers regarding T&E (SEA-17). A first town meeting had been held in February, 1976.

A two-page centerfold in the March Interact was devoted to a description of the activities and services of the EICs. The presentation was in question and answer form and explained how EICs helped LEAs address program improvement needs. Also in March, questions regarding minimum standards set by the State as an outcome of the Educational Assessment Program were answered (SEA-18).

Commissioner Burke expressed his optimism regarding the State's progress in implementing T&E in the April issue of Interact. The comments were made during Dr. Burke's appearance before the legislature's Joint Appropriation Committee in March, 1977 (SEA-19).

The entire May/June, 1977 Interact is devoted to T&E. Major articles included on T&E priorities, a T&E calendar for 1977-78, minimum standards test results, and needs assessment (SEA-20). The issue will be part of the training package developed for the Convocation of School Executive Academy members (SEA-1).

News releases prepared by the Department were directed at improving communication with the general public, clarifying Department policy and actions. Appendix SEA-21 contains samples of such releases.

4. Educational Financing

One objective was established in the area of educational financing:

- For FY 1977, the New Jersey SEA will strengthen its internal management and financial operations as well as to provide fiscal/auditing assistance to LEAs as evidenced by an annual financial report submitted to the Commissioner (Annual Program Plan, p. 85).

Documentation

Both new and continuing activities were undertaken in FY 1977 to address this objective. Major activities related to: 1) internal SEA fiscal management; 2) auditing; 3) grants management; and, 4) program budgeting.

The accounting system employed by the Department was redesigned during FY 1977 to enable the SEA to utilize Department funds more efficiently. A series of eighteen monthly reports is produced by the accounting system. These reports assist Division and project managers to maintain tight fiscal controls and to plan expenditures (SEA-22).

Monthly reports prepared by the Chief Auditor document the nature and extent of auditing activities during FY 1977. Services were provided in auditing and evaluations, ESEA inspection reports, monitoring services and assistance, accounting and payroll conversions, and requested reviews.

Other routine activities conducted were: 1) reviewing local school district audits; 2) preparing Annual Financial Reports; 3) recording and

acknowledging receipt of all reports; 4) compiling financial and statistical information for the Commissioner's Annual Report; 5) reviewing accounting and procedural manuals for changes required by action of the State Board and legislature; and, 6) reviewing reporting forms annually for changes needed before printing and distribution (SEA-23).

The Bureau of Grants Management provides overall fiscal management for grant resources. During FY 1977 it: 1) provided analyses of new, existing, and pending federal legislation; 2) promoted utilization of federal resources to coordinate, strengthen, and support educational priorities; and, 3) reviewed all non-state contracts and grants to insure fiscal soundness and compliance with federal and state regulations. The Bureau monitored federal legislation and education reports and informed relevant SEA staff of pertinent information. It provided assistance to all SEA staff in proposal development and review, seeking to avoid duplication and foster cooperation with the agency. A resource center on federal educational laws was also maintained (SEA-24).

During FY 1977, activities were continued in assisting districts to develop and implement program budgeting systems. T&E legislation and regulations require such systems to be implemented during the development of the T&E planning process. Pilot activities initiated in FY 1976 were expanded with the addition of ten districts to the approximately thirty-two that used the system previously. Workshops for local district personnel were increased so as to provide more assistance. Appendix SEA-25 provides information on program budgeting design and pilot implementation activities conducted during FY 1976.

5. Assistance to Local Education Agencies

One objective was established for this area:

- Throughout FY 1977 the New Jersey SEA will provide LEAs with direct consultative and technical services as required to deliver a T&E system as evidenced by a report to be submitted to the Commissioner (Annual Program Plan, p. 86).

Documentation

Several sets of activities are addressed to the LEA assistance objective. These assistance activities are: 1) school facility planning; 2) certification and accreditation; 3) grantsmanship; and, 4) EIC and County Office services.

In addition to a major emphasis on providing assistance to LEAs within the context of T&E, the Department also provided services to districts in teacher certification and facilities planning. Facilities planning services were provided to all local school districts to ensure the provision of suitable educational facilities. New school site selection, projecting long-range capital needs, and utilizing healthful and safe temporary and permanent facilities were some of the major services of the Bureau of Facility Planning Services (SEA-26).

The major activities conducted by the certification unit during FY 1977 were:

1) coordination of college and university teacher education program approvals (SEA-27)
2) monitoring of the implementation of new certification rules and regulations in college and university teacher education programs, and in the public school districts (SEA-28)
3) certification of teachers and other professional educators (SEA-29)

During FY 1977, the Bureau of Grants management published a Directory of Federal Programs (SEA-30). In addition, Bureau staff ran eight workshops throughout FY 1977 for local district personnel on identifying federal grant resources and applying for federal funds (SEA-31). The workshops were attended by over two hundred local educators (SEA-24).

EIC and County Office services to LEAs have been focused primarily on support to the T&E process. In-service training sessions have been conducted for teachers and administrators. Retrieval of research and practice information is available to all local educators. Several seminars and workshops have been conducted to explain various aspects of T&E implementation. Training packages were developed in assessment procedures, objectives/indicators procedures, and planning/management training systems. County Office services are focused primarily on assisting LEAs in the school approval process component of T&E (SEA-5).

C. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROCESS

Documentation resulting from a review of materials, of self-assessment reports, and from interviews indicates that all activities addressing the six stated objectives generally were undertaken as projected. As in FY 1976, the Department exceeded projected activities and services specified in the Annual Program Plan. Several of the activities were continuations of ones initiated in FY 1976. In almost every case of a continuation activity, an expansion in quantity or quality of services appears to have been realized. Major new or expanded activities in FY 1977 include: 1) the full implementation of the County Offices and the EICs in supporting the development of T&E processes in local school districts; and, 2) the implementation of the Operational Planning System.

As was the case in FY 1976, a small number of activities appear to be on-going, standard operating procedures and not related to the short-term development of new programs. Such activities and services as teacher certification, facility planning, auditing, accounting, and Interact appear to be well established and fully operational. Some also are peripheral to the T&E "theme" of the Annual Program Plan. Since the major purpose of the Title IV Program is to support the development of new initiatives in SEAs, these activities may be ready to be transferred to the State budget, allowing for the development of new activities to be initiated.

D. ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

In addition to being able to cite immediate outcomes of activities, Department staff were able to offer some information on the impact of some of the activities and services provided. This assessment information responds to a recommendation made in the FY 1976 report[1] regarding the development of proximate indicators of impact. While there is still some progress that needs to be made in this area, FY 1977 data represents an improvement over that collected in FY 1976. Some of this increased attention to outcomes and impact is attributable to the self-assessment form used to gather preliminary data for the evaluation of the Program.

Several notable accomplishments were realized in the Strengthening SEAs Program in FY 1977. A brief discussion of these follows.

The intermediate unit structure was fully developed during FY 1977 and is providing an extensive amount of services to local school districts

[1]Statewide Evaluation of E.S.E.A. Title IV in New Jersey for Fiscal Year 1976, Education and Public Affairs, September 30, 1976.

in the development of T&E activities. Given the magnitude of the change that T&E requires in the management of education at the local level, it is unlikely that such changes could take place without extensive support from the County Offices and the EICs.

The scope and quality of services available appear to be excellent and feedback from local district personnel is positive. Given that T&E places great demands on local administrators, the frequent contacts between intermediate unit staff and local staff place both parties in a collaborative role in implementing change.

The role differentiation between the County Offices and the EICs with respect to T&E is not clear. The regulatory vs. service distinction which was intended is not apparent in the description of roles provided by each (SEA-1). In addition, the roles and functions of the EICs with respect to service relationships with LEAs are not well defined. At present, no description is available of rationale and relationships vis-a-vis the Department or with each other. The degree to which all EICs are to be similar or unique is left undefined. These variables are likely to be important in the future development of the EICs.

An exemplary activity of the EICs is the development of a formal evaluation system for keeping managers at the EIC and the Department informed on the responsiveness of EICs to LEA needs and of the impact of EIC services. It would appear, however, that the development of such an evaluation system should follow the development of a rationale and role delineation for the EICs in the State's education system.

The Regional Needs Inventory is an important source of information for defining the service delivery system of the EICs. The Inventory

documents well the general and specific needs of LEAs. Its existence as an activity puts districts on notice that the Department and the EICs are making a concerted effort to provide responsive services. Since it raises expectations, the EICs must be ready to respond to the LEAs needs. Documentation of EIC activities indicates that such a response is taking place.

Progress in the design and implementation of the Operational Planning System was substantial during FY 1977. In FY 1976, the basic design was completed but implementation had only been started in the Department. The inclusion of the County Offices and the EICs will make it possible to tie the Department and the intermediate units together more closely in terms of T&E related objectives. One danger of so complex a process is that it may become a burden to Department and intermediate unit staff. In order to be useful, the System must be able to provide useful information for decision makers at all levels without requiring an inordinant amount of time for input.

At this point, the major outcome of the OPS activity is that an operational plan has been produced for FY 1977. No formal assessment has been undertaken to determine whether the purposes of the OPS and its reporting systems are being met. Some questions which may be appropriate for such an assessment are:

1) What problems are identified through the monthly progress reports?
2) What decisions are made as a result of the monthly progress reports?
3) How, specifically, has two-way communication been enhanced between the various levels of organization?

4) How are the monthly progress reports used in staff meetings?

The Interact articles and the newspaper itself are an exemplary response to the objective for dissemination. The timeliness of the articles helps to keep the educational and lay communities up to date on T&E. Circulation was 30,000 in FY 1977, an increase of 4,000 over that in FY 1976.

The fact that Interact represents a one-stop information source for educator and public information is a significant outcome in itself. In many SEAs, the number of individual publications which are distributed to educators and other groups is excessive. Fragmentation, duplication, and miscommunication often result. The development of Interact has eliminated a substantial amount of such fragmentation and duplication. Given that the newspaper has received three national awards, it is possible to say that Interact as a one-stop communication vehicle is much more than just a cost savings device.

Outcome and impact information regarding Interact are not collected formally. That communication is taking place (a primary outcome of the newspaper) is attested to by the letters to the Editor, requests for information from educators and other persons and informal feedback from LEA administrators. It is used as an orientation and training tool on T&E by local school boards and other education agencies.

As in FY 1976, feedback mechanisms and assessment information systems remain ad hoc and informal. Two-way communication usually is a serendipitous by-product of a mass distribution newspaper. Moreover, mass communications do not allow for targeting specific groups (e.g., superintendents, teachers, and parents) with specific information. Some Interact articles

are addressed to specific groups (citizens, PTA members) but no information is available concerning how many of those persons received and read the particular article.

While there has been some effort to develop mechanisms for determining whether intended outcomes are being realized and whether these outcomes are having any impact on education, such efforts, in most cases, appear to be inadequate to the magnitude of the activities being implemented. An evaluation design for the EICs will be an exception to this generalization. Indicators of intended outcomes and impact have been formulated and measures are being developed to provide data on those indicators. Few of the other major strengthening SEA efforts have this capability.

As was the case in FY 1976, the FY 1977 Strengthening SEA Program was marked by a high degree of coherence and purposefulness. Also, in seeking to "institutionalize" activities and services initiated with Title IV funds, twenty-seven positions, supported previously by over $500,000 of Title IV funds, were switched to State funding during FY 1977. The quality of many of the activities undertaken is high and several of the projects (e.g., OPS, program, budgeting, EIC evaluation, T&E delivery system, and grantsmanship training) should be disseminated as model practices to other SEAs.

E. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE PLANNING

The FY 1976 evaluation report[2] made five recommendations regarding the development of the Program. Two of them continue to be relevant as

[2] Ibid.

recommendations for the FY 1977 Strengthening SEA Program and are updated and repeated for this Report.

1) Measuring the outcomes and impact of Strengthening SEA activities is impeded by the lack of measurable and proximate indicators of achievement. Many of the activities in the Annual Program Plan are stated in global and vague language. Specifications in operational terms are seldom available. Such specifications would facilitate the development of formative and summative evaluation designs which, when implemented, could become part of the on-going administration of the activity.

2) As in FY 1976, the Department relied heavily on Interact for its communications regarding T&E. While Interact is a high quality, one-way communications mechanism, formal feedback mechanisms should be employed. The Department should consider the use of multiple methods for ascertaining reader response to the paper, particularly to those articles dealing with T&E. "Town Meeting II" represents an excellent model for moving in that direction.

Other recommendations for the continued development and growth of the Program are:

3) An effort should be made to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the EICs vis-a-vis the County Offices. Available descriptive material does not accomplish this. Also, some attention should be given to helping the EICs establish a clear mission statement which addresses such issues as their relationships with the Department and with the LEAs and the degree to which they are to offer similar services as opposed to "unique" services addressed to regional needs. The EICs represent a major organizational

innovation, thus requiring clarity of purpose and role for effective implementation.

4) Because T&E is a major innovation which is receiving much national attention and because Title IV, particularly the Strengthening SEAs Program, is so integrated with it, the Department should consider the development of a broad case study of the design and implementation process. This information would be most useful as a summary of the specific information being collected in the State and would provide a valuable service to other SEAs engaged in similar activities. The T&E effort in New Jersey has several features which are exemplary and worthy of dissemination nationally.

F. ALLOCATION OF TITLE IV FUNDS

The table on the following page illustrates the allocation of the IV-C funds which supported the Program for Strengthening Leadership Resources of State Education Agencies. Estimated and actual expenditures, as provided by SEA program staff, are given for the activities discussed in this Report. This Report, however, is a program audit, not a financial audit.

TABLE V - 1

ALLOCATION OF TITLE IV FUNDS TO
STRENGTHENING SEA ACTIVITIES
FY 1977

Activity	Estimated [1] Expenditures Staff	Estimated [1] Expenditures Funds	Actual [2] Expenditures Staff	Actual [2] Expenditures Funds
Planning and Evaluation	22	$ 394,144	24	$ 341,613
Educational Data Info Sys.	2	135,320	12	157,414
Dissemination	2	98,704	4	62,433
Educational financing	11	380,500	13	199,301
Assistance to LEAs	27	365,105	31	521,388
Subtotal	64	1,373,773	84	1,282,149
Equipment, Materials, and Support		---		414,680
TOTAL		$1,171,773		$1,696,829

[1]As proposed in Annual Program Plan

[2]Not Based on Audit Data

SECTION VI

ANNOTATED LISTING OF APPENDICES

TITLE IV MANAGEMENT

Appendix Number	Title and Description
II-1	PERT, Title IV Program. New Jersey Department of Education, May, 1976. The PERT chart and activity dictionary present timelines for major activities. Responsible staff are also identified.
II-2	Grant Award Routing Slip. New Jersey Department of Education, June, 1977. Grant award forms for approving Title IV-C grants
II-3	Sample Correspondence Copies of correspondence from Title IV Office illustrating variety of communications sent out
II-4	Reorganization Plan for Title IV-C. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976 Plan describes roles and responsibilities of Department units in carrying out Title IV activities.
II-5	Agendas and Minutes, State Title IV Advisory Council. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976-77. Agendas and minutes of all SAC meetings conducted during FY 1977
II-6	Presentation to National Title IV Conference, Washington, D. C. February 1977. State Title IV Coordinator's speech on the Title IV Program in New Jersey

TITLE IV-B, LIBRARIES AND LEARNING RESOURCES

Appendix Number	Title and Description
IV-B-1	Calculation of Local School District Allotment for P.L. 93-380, Title IV, Part B. New Jersey Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance, 1976. Table provides information on the allotment of Title IV-B funds by county. Lowest and highest allotment per student and lowest and highest total allotments are provided for each county.
IV-B-2	Report of Findings of On-Site Evaluations of a Sample of Title IV-B Projects. (Supplement to Evaluation of Title IV in New Jersey, Educational Consulting Services, 1977). This supplementary report provides a summary of findings of the on-site interviews conducted in a sample of thirty-eight districts. The interview schedule used to collect data is included as an appendix to the report.
IV-B-3	Project Application, ESEA Title IV-B. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976-77. Application has eight sections dealing with such information requirements as basic data, non-public school involvement, and maintenance of effort.
IV-B-4	Annual Program Plan for the Consolidation of Libraries and Learning Resources, Educational Innovation and Support, Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as Amended, Added by Section 401, P.L. 93-380. "II.4.2: Criteria for Distribution of Funds, Part B", FY 1977. The Program Plan describes three formulas developed and applied to meet the requirements of the Act regarding the distribution of Part B funds. The formulas concern distribution based on the number of students, the LEA per pupil expenditure, and percentage of children from families receiving AFDC funds.

IV-B-5 Title IV-B Allocation for Essex County, FY77. New Jersey Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance, 1976.

Table provides information on expenditures, equalization value, tax rate, percent AFDC, enrollment, and allotments for school districts in Essex County.

IV-B-6 Sample Allotment Table. New Jersey Department of Education, Division of Administration and Finance, 1976.

A computer print-out from the State Department of Education notified the LEA of the amount of per-pupil funding. This sample allotment table shows factors producing allotment calculations and the allotment per enrollment for schools in the Newark district.

IV-B-7 Letters of Notification. New Jersey Department of Education.

Letters of notification of available funds under ESEA Title IV were sent by both the Commissioner and the State Title IV Coordinator. An additional letter regarding reopening of the Title IV-B application period was sent by the Title IV-B Coordinator in April, 1977.

IV-B-8 Guidelines for ESEA Title IV, Part B. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976-77.

The guidelines provide detailed information relating to standards for determining the eligibility of Title IV-B items in: 1) school library resources, textbooks and other instructional materials; 2) instructional equipment and minor remodeling; and, 3) guidance and counseling services, testing materials and services.

IV-B-9 ESEA Title IV, Part C -- Continuation Grants, Supplementation of Grant Awards and Extension of Grant Periods, U.S. Office of Education, 1977.

Page 3 of this memorandum explains the exceptional situation whereby applications for IV-B funds may be received at more than one time during the fiscal year.

IV-B-10 Orientation Sessions for Local School Districts Applying for Title IV Funds Available under Parts B and C. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976.

This memorandum advises all local district personnel of the times, dates, and locations for orientation sessions regarding application for Title IV funds.

IV-B-11 ESEA, Title IV-B, Maintenance of Effort Summary. New Jersey Department of Education, 1977.

This memorandum shows expenditures by county for FY76 and for FY77. Total expenditures for FY76 were $91,302,141 and for FY77 were $98,550,603.

IV-B-12 Exemplary Title IV-B Projects. New Jersey Department of Education, December 3, 1976.

Memorandum describing selection process for identifying five exemplary Title IV-B projects.

IV-B-13 Discussion Guide: Evaluation and Reporting. U. S. Office of Education, February, 1977.

This guide provides information regarding evaluation and reporting requirements and suggests options for compliance.

IV-B-14 ESEA Title IV: Maintenance of Effort Requirements, U.S. Office of Education, April 20, 1977.

This memorandum explains the new maintenance of effort requirements which are extended to all non-public schools.

TITLE IV-C, EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

Appendix Number	Title and Description
IV-C-1	Annual Program Plan. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976. The plan for Title IV-C, Educational Innovation summarizes the educational goals for the State of New Jersey, provides achievement data, lists educational priorities for the State, and describes the processes used in administering the Program.
IV-C-2	Guidelines for ESEA, Title IV, Part C. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976-77. The guidelines provide information, directions, and forms for applying under ESEA, Title IV-C.
IV-C-3	Program Announcement, ESEA, Title IV. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976. Notifications of available funds under ESEA, Title IV were sent by both the Commissioner and the State Title IV Coordinator to all LEAs. The notifications contained information on a special Request for Proposals in the area of Math.
IV-C-4	Program Announcement, ESEA, Title IV. New Jersey Department of Education, 1977. Notification of additional available funds under ESEA, Title IV was sent to all local districts in the Spring of 1977. The notification contained information on a Request for Proposals for supplemental center services on a multi-district basis.
IV-C-5	Table of Newly Selected Projects and Priorities Addressed. New Jersey Department of Education, 1977.
IV-C-6	Technical Review Forms for Development and Validation Proposals. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976-77. These forms are used by the review teams in rating the clarity and consistency of draft proposals for development projects and for validating established projects.

IV-C-7 Reviewers of Development and RFP Applications.

Brief resumes showing the qualifications of persons selected to review and rate IV-C development and RFP applications.

IV-C-8 ESEA, Title IV-C Selection Process Review Forms, Stage I. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976.

Forms used for review and rating of three types of IV-C applications: development, validation, and RFP

IV-C-9 Package of Materials for Stage II Reviewers. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976.

Includes description of the Stage II process and criteria for approving projects

IV-C-10 Statistical Information: First Year-Projects Only. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976.

Forms for showing pupil membership by grade and specific student population to be served, by public and non-public schools

IV-C-11 Sample Correspondence.

Samples of correspondence between public and private, non-profit schools concerning participation in Title IV-C projects

IV-C-12 Participation of Non-Public, Private Schools in ESEA, IV-C during FY77. New Jersey Department of Education, July 22, 1977.

This memo to the State Title IV-C Coordinator provides information on the number of IV-C development applications submitted which contained documentation regarding efforts to involve non-public schools in the planning of proposals.

IV-C-13 Manual for On-Site Evaluations. New Jersey Department of Education, 1977.

A handbook for evaluation consultants conducting Title IV-C on-site evaluations.

IV-C-14 Project Evaluation Report. New Jersey Department of Education, 1977.

Forms to accompany Manual for On-Site Evaluations

IV-C-15 On-site Evaluation Progress Report. New Jersey Department of Education, April 25, 1977.

Report outlines progress in conducting on-site evaluations of IV-C projects.

IV-C-16 Sample End-of-Year Reports.

Reports from Manasquan and Highland Park describe process and product outcomes of previous year's developmental project.

IV-C-17 Project Visitation Log. New Jersey Department of Education, 1977.

Samples of the logs used for monitoring projects and documenting problems and remedial steps taken.

IV-C-18 Criteria for Evaluation Design. New Jersey Department of Education, 1977.

Guidelines for districts in constructing an evaluation design for a Title IV-C project.

IV-C-19 A Management Training Institute for Managers of Change. Capla Associates, Inc., Rochelle Park, New Jersey, 1976.

Materials for a management training program for both project directors and SEA process consultants who monitor IV-C projects.

IV-C-20 Educational Development Conference. New Jersey Department of Education, January, 1977.

The Agenda outlines the statewide Title IV Conference meant to provide workshops on educational change and development and to honor exemplary IV-B and IV-C projects.

IV-C-21 Allocation of Title IV-C Funds to Development and Dissemination Activities, FY77.

This memorandum shows the amounts (in dollars and percentages) allocated to development and dissemination activities during FY77.

IV-C-22 Distribution of ESEA Title IV-C Projects by Type of District.

Memorandum indicating that 10 of New Jersey's 28 urban districts received funding under Title IV-C in FY 1977. The fourteen projects in the ten districts received approximately 50% of FY 1977 Title IV-C funds.

IV-C-23 Report on Urban Involvement under ESEA, Title IV-C. New Jersey Department of Education, Office of Program Development, Undated.

Title IV-C projects addressed to urban needs. Funding levels are given.

IV-C-24 Interim Report on the ESEA, Title IV-C Dissemination Program for 1976-77. New Jersey Department of Education, May, 1977.

Summaries of data are provided on the Project Center's dissemination activities for the period July to December, 1976. A description is provided of each project. Included are references to manuals written or edited, feature articles written for Interact, mailings, presentations, participation in conferences, and technical assistance given. Costs of dissemination activities are also provided.

IV-C-25 Educational Programs That Work. New Jersey Department of Education, January, 1977.

A catalog of demonstration sites of successful educational programs disseminated through the New Jersey ESEA, Title IV-C Program.

IV-C-26 Status Report on ESEA, Title IV Development Projects, New Jersey Department of Education, 1977.

This table shows the number of projects completing development, validation, and termination before completion for FY77.

IV-C-27 Dissemination Status Report, New Jersey Department of Education, 1977.

This table provides information on the dissemination activities of the thirty projects funded under ESEA, Title IV-C. The project, its originating district, data validation and the type of dissemination/adoption model used are provided.

IV-C-28 Adoptions of New Jersey's ESEA, Title IV-C Projects During the Period July 1, 1976 to December 31, 1976.

This table shows, by project, the number of adoptions within New Jersey and out-of-state, and the number of turnkey trainers developed both in and out of state.

IV-C-29 List of Locations at Which Information on Successful Programs is Kept.

Twenty-seven locations at which information on successful New Jersey IV-C projects is kept as a means of increasing adoption.

IV-C-30 Project Impact Report, New Jersey Department of Education, 1977.

Table, showing by project, the number of adopting districts and the number of students, teachers, administrators, and community persons impacted.

IV-C-31 Development Project Ratings.

Table, showing by project (log numbers), the ratings awarded by on-site evaluators for innovativeness, effort, costs, and exportability.

IV-C-32 "Goals of the State Education Agency Development Program," Speech by Commissioner Fred G. Burke, Educational Development Conference, January, 1977.

Dr. Burke reviews successes and limitations of the "lighthouse" development concept and suggests a new model for developing and disseminating educational innovations.

PROGRAM FOR STRENGTHENING LEADERSHIP RESOURCES OF

STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

Appendix Number	Title and Description
SEA-1	Self-Assessment Reports. Self-assessment reports on activities, outcomes and impacts were prepared by SEA staff involved in Strengthening SEA Program activities. Reports are available for each of the five areas in the Annual Program Plan.
SEA-2	Operational Plan. Office of Planning, Research and and Program Development, New Jersey Department of Education, 1976. The Plan lists primary and secondary objectives and activities for the planning unit.
SEA-3	Policy Research Papers. Policy Research Program, New Jersey Department of Education, 1976-77. A collection of papers dealing with policy analysis and recommendations in urban, career, and comprehensive arts education
SEA-4	Early Childhood Planning Project. New Jersey Department of Education, FY 1977. Descriptions of policy research papers produced for the Early Childhood Planning Project.
SEA-5	County Office Operational Plan, New Jersey Department of Education, 1977. Plan describes objectives and activities for Union County. An organizational chart and time line is included.

SEA-6 1976 New Jersey Regional Needs Inventory. New Jersey Department of Education, March, 1977.

Report summarizes results of a survey of LEA service needs to which the EICs are to respond.

SEA-7 Operational Planning Design. New Jersey Department of Education, March, 1977.

Materials describe the broad planning design for applying the T&E model to the SEA. Components and procedures are described, as is a monthly reporting system.

SEA-8 Standard Operating Procedures for Collecting Data From Local Education Agencies. New Jersey Department of Education, April, 1976.

Procedures to be used in data collection activities administered by the Department of Education are described. An information communication system is described, step-by-step procedures are presented, and functions and roles of data collection participants are delineated.

SEA-9 Department Data Collection Instrument Progress Report. New Jersey Department of Education, June, 1976.

This draft document presents the results of a review of data collection instruments used by th New Jersey Department of Education. The process of instrument review and consolidation is described. A list of approved instruments for the 1976-77 school year is appended to the report.

SEA-10 Data Dictionary. New Jersey Department of Education, June, 1977.

The data dictionary serves as a guide and reference tool for all data collection for the New Jersey Department of Education.

SEA-11 Statistical Reports. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976-77.

Sample of statistical information developed by the New Jersey Department of Education.

SEA-12 Interact. Volume 3, No. 2, September, 1976, p. 1 and pp. 10-13.

Articles entitled "Professor Studies Political Reactions to T&E Court Rule" and "T&E: School Improvement in New Jersey.

SEA-13 Interact. Volume 3, No. 3, October, 1976, p. 10.

"ERIC has bibliography on New Jersey's T&E" describes nine journal articles and six documents on T&E.

SEA-14 Interact. Volume 3, No. 4, November, 1976, pp.4 and 9.

Articles entitled "Join in T&E Procedures Says State PTA to Public" and "Here's How One N.J. School District is Complying with the New T&E Law."

SEA-15 Interact. Volume 3, No. 5, December, 1976, p. 3.

"Questions and Answers on Thorough and Efficient" explains T&E and terminology.

SEA-16 Interact. Volume 3, No. 6, January, 1977, p. 7.

"State PTA Lists T&E Procedures for Local Organizations to Follow" presents eight steps for local PTA involvement.

SEA-17 Interact. Volume 3, No. 7, February, 1977, pp. 2 and 20.

"T&E: The Law and the Citizen" helps citizens understand the T&E process and the benefits it can produce. "Town Meeting II" announces the second meeting on T&E broadcast to the public via television.

SEA-18 Interact. Volume 3, No. 8, March, 1977, p. 3 and pp. 8-9.

"Minimum Standards Questions Answered" and "The EICs."

SEA-19 Interact. Volume 3, No. 9, April, 1977, p. 3.

In "T&E has Bright Future According to Dr. Burke," the Commissioner cites professional and public support for T&E.

SEA-20 Interact. Volume 3, No. 10, May/June, 1977.

Entire special issue devoted to T&E. Major articles on T&E priorities, T&E calendar for 1977-78, minimum standards test results, and needs assessment.

SEA-21 Sample News Releases. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976-77.

Sample news releases issued by the Department.

SEA-22 Monthly Accounting Reports. New Jersey Department of Education, February 1, 1977.

Memorandum explaining the eighteen monthly accounting reports produced through the new accounting system.

SEA-23 Interoffice Memoranda - Auditing Section. New Jersey Department of Education.

This collection of thirteen memoranda outline the major accomplishments of the auditing section during FY 1977. Major activities are reported for the areas of auditing and evaluation, ESEA inspections, accounting and payroll conversions, and technical assistance to local school districts.

SEA-24 Grants Management Activities, New Jersey Department of Education, May 25, 1977.

Memorandum describing activities of Bureau of Grants Management during FY 1977. Attachments contain details of grant management activities.

SEA-25 Program Budgeting Publication and Materials. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976-77.

A collection of PPBS materials describing workshop agendas and publications for use in implementing program budgeting in New Jersey LEAs.

SEA-26 Memoranda, Bureau of Facility Planning Services. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976-77.

Samples of memoranda sent to LEAs and other education officials regarding facility planning.

SEA-27 Approved Courses. New Jersey Department of Education, March 17, 1977.

Memorandum illustrating the nature of approval activities for teacher education programs.

SEA-28 Regulations and Standards for Certification. New Jersey Department of Education, 1976.

Annual publication of New Jersey Department of Education concerning regulations and standards for certification.

SEA-29 Teacher Education and Academic Credentials. New Jersey Department of Education, 1977.

A summary of authorizations issued between July 1, 1976, and March 31, 1977.

SEA-30 A Directory of Federal Programs. New Jersey Department of Education, September, 1976.

This directory outlines federal programs which are administered by the New Jersey Department of Education. The Directory emphasizes those programs for which local education agencies are eligible for participation.

SEA-31 Grantsmanship Training Seminar. New Jersey Department of Education.

An agenda outlining topics covered at eight seminars run on grantsmanship.

SECTION VII

PERSONS INTERVIEWED

	Name	Title
1.	Daniel Bevilaqua	Assistant Director Bureau of Grants Management
2.	Stephen Blaustein	Director Program Management and Development
3.	Thomas Corcoran	State Director, Evaluation
4.	Frank Falconieri	Consultant Research, Planning and Evaluation
5.	Ronald Lesher	Evaluation Specialist
6.	Richard Mills	Planning Associate
7.	Joseph Picogna	State Director, Title IV
8.	Robert Russell	Chief, Data Processing
9.	W. Randolph Schaeffer	Assistant Director Educational Plans and Supplemental Centers
10.	Robert Swissler	Coordinator, Title IV-B